arXiv:1402.3227v3 [math.CO] 15 Jan 2016

ADDITION-DELETION THEOREMS FOR FACTORIZATIONS OF ORLIK-SOLOMON ALGEBRAS AND NICE ARRANGEMENTS

TORSTEN HOGE AND GERHARD RÖHRLE

Abstract. We study the notion of a nice partition or factorization of a hyperplane arrangement due to Terao from the early 1990s. The principal aim of this note is an analogue of Terao's celebrated addition-deletion theorem for free arrangements for the class of nice arrangements. This is a natural setting for the stronger property of an inductive factorization of a hyperplane arrangement by Jambu and Paris.

In addition, we show that supersolvable arrangements are inductively factored and that inductively factored arrangements are inductively free. Combined with our addition-deletion theorem this leads to the concept of an induction table for inductive factorizations.

Finally, we prove that the notions of factored and inductively factored arrangements are compatible with the product construction for arrangements.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a field and let $V = \mathbb{K}^\ell$. Let $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}, V)$ be a central ℓ-arrangement of hyperplanes in V. The most basic algebraic invariant associated with an arrangement $\mathcal{A}$ is its so called *Orlik-Solomon algebra* $A(\mathcal{A})$, introduced by Orlik and Solomon in [OS80]. The $\mathbb{K}$-algebra $A(\mathcal{A})$ is a graded and anti-commutative. It is generated by 1 in degree 0 and by a set of degree 1 generators $\{a_H \mid H \in \mathcal{A}\}$, e.g. see [OT92, §3.1]. Let $A(\mathcal{A}) = \oplus_{i=0}^r A(\mathcal{A})_i$ be the decomposition of $A(\mathcal{A})$ into homogeneous components, so that $\operatorname{Poin}(A(\mathcal{A}), t) = \sum_{i=0}^r (\dim A(\mathcal{A})_i) t^i$, where $r = r(\mathcal{A})$ is the rank of $\mathcal{A}$. In particular, $A(\mathcal{A})_0 = \mathbb{K}$ and $A(\mathcal{A})_1 = \sum_{H\in\mathcal{A}} \mathbb{K} a_H$.

Thanks to a fundamental result due to Orlik and Solomon [OS80, Thm. 2.6] (cf. [OT92, Thm. 3.68]), the Poincaré polynomial of $A(\mathcal{A})$ coincides with the combinatorially defined Poincaré polynomial $\pi(\mathcal{A}, t)$ of $\mathcal{A}$,

$$\operatorname{Poin}(A(\mathcal{A}), t) = \pi(\mathcal{A}, t). \tag{1.1}$$

The geometric significance of $A(\mathcal{A})$ stems from the fact that in case $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ is the field of complex numbers, Orlik and Solomon showed in [OS80, Thm. 5.2] that as an associative, graded $\mathbb{C}$-algebra $A(\mathcal{A})$ is isomorphic to the cohomology algebra of the complement $M(\mathcal{A})$ of the complex arrangement $\mathcal{A}$ (cf. [OT92, §5.4]):

$$A(\mathcal{A}) \cong H^*(M(\mathcal{A})).$$

In particular, the Poincaré polynomial $\operatorname{Poin}(M(\mathcal{A}), t)$ of $M(\mathcal{A})$ is given by $\operatorname{Poin}(A(\mathcal{A}), t)$.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 52B30, 52C35, 14N20; Secondary 51D20.

Key words and phrases. Orlik-Solomon algebra, supersolvable arrangement, nice arrangement, inductively factored arrangement, free and inductively free arrangement.

We acknowledge support from the DFG-priority program SPP1489 "Algorithmic and Experimental Methods in Algebra, Geometry, and Number Theory".

Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_s)$ be a partition of $\mathcal{A}$ and let

$$[\pi_i] := \mathbb{K} + \sum_{H \in \pi_i} \mathbb{K} a_H$$

be the $\mathbb{K}$-subspace of $A(\mathcal{A})$ spanned by 1 and the set of $\mathbb{K}$-algebra generators a_H of $A(\mathcal{A})$ corresponding to the members in π_i. So the Poincaré polynomial of the graded $\mathbb{K}$-vector space $[\pi_i]$ is just $\mathrm{Poin}([\pi_i], t) = 1 + |\pi_i| t$. Consider the canonical $\mathbb{K}$-linear map

$$\kappa : [\pi_1] \otimes \cdots \otimes [\pi_s] \to A(\mathcal{A}) \tag{1.2}$$

given by multiplication. We say that π gives rise to a *tensor factorization* of $A(\mathcal{A})$ if κ is an isomorphism of graded $\mathbb{K}$-vector spaces. In this case $s = r$, as r is the top degree of $A(\mathcal{A})$, and thus we get a factorization of the Poincaré polynomial of $A(\mathcal{A})$ into linear terms

$$\mathrm{Poin}(A(\mathcal{A}), t) = \prod_{i=1}^{r} (1 + |\pi_i| t). \tag{1.3}$$

For $\mathcal{A} = \Phi_\ell$ the empty arrangement, we set $[\varnothing] := \mathbb{K}$, so that $\kappa : [\varnothing] \cong A(\Phi_\ell)$.

In [OST84, Thm. 5.3], Orlik, Solomon and Terao showed that a supersolvable arrangement $\mathcal{A}$ admits a partition π which gives rise to a tensor factorization of $A(\mathcal{A})$ via κ in (1.2) (cf. [OT92, Thm. 3.81]). Jambu gave an alternate proof of this fact in [J90, Prop. 3.2.2]. In [BZ91], Björner and Ziegler gave a sufficient condition for such factorizations of $A(\mathcal{A})$.

In [Ter92], Terao was able to capture this tensor factorization property of $A(\mathcal{A})$ as in (1.2) purely combinatorially in terms of the underlying partition π, as follows. Let $L(\mathcal{A})$ be the intersection lattice of $\mathcal{A}$. To each X in $L(\mathcal{A})$ we associate the subarrangement $\mathcal{A}_X$ of $\mathcal{A}$, where $\mathcal{A}_X = \{H \in \mathcal{A} \mid X \subset H\}$. Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_s)$ be a partition of $\mathcal{A}$. Following [Ter92], π is called *nice* for $\mathcal{A}$ or a *factorization* of $\mathcal{A}$ if firstly π is *independent*, i.e. for any choice $H_i \in \pi_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$, the resulting s hyperplanes are linearly independent, and secondly, for each X in $L(\mathcal{A})$, the *induced partition* π_X of $\mathcal{A}_X$ consisting of the non-empty blocks of the form $\pi_i \cap \mathcal{A}_X$ admits a singleton as one of its parts, see Definition 2.14. We also say that $\mathcal{A}$ is *nice* or *factored* provided $\mathcal{A}$ admits a nice partition.

In [Ter92, Thm. 2.8], Terao proved that π gives rise to a tensor factorization of the Orlik-Solomon algebra $A(\mathcal{A})$ via κ as in (1.2) if and only if π is nice for $\mathcal{A}$, see Theorem 2.16 (cf. [OT92, Thm. 3.87]). Note that κ is not an isomorphim of $\mathbb{K}$-algebras.

In order to state our principal results, we need a bit more notation. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is non-empty and let $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_s)$ be a partition of $\mathcal{A}$. Let $H_0 \in \pi_1$ and let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ be the triple associated with H_0. We have the *induced partition* π' of $\mathcal{A}'$ consisting of the non-empty parts $\pi'_i := \pi_i \cap \mathcal{A}'$. Further, we have the *restriction map* $\varrho = \varrho_{\pi, H_0} : \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1 \to \mathcal{A}''$ given by $H \mapsto H \cap H_0$, depending on π and H_0. Let $\pi''_i := \varrho(\pi_i)$ for $i = 2, \ldots, s$. Clearly, imposing that $\pi'' = (\pi''_2, \ldots, \pi''_s)$ is again a partition of $\mathcal{A}''$ entails that ϱ is onto. It turns out that the injectivity of ϱ is the key condition in our context.

Our chief result for Orlik-Solomon algebras is the following Addition-Deletion Theorem for tensor factorizations of $A(\mathcal{A})$ of the form (1.2). Analogous to κ in (1.2), κ' and κ'' are the $\mathbb{K}$-linear maps determined by the partitions π' and π'' of $\mathcal{A}'$ and $\mathcal{A}''$, respectively.

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \neq \Phi_\ell$. Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_s)$ be a partition of $\mathcal{A}$. Let $H_0 \in \pi_1$ and let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ be the triple associated with H_0. Suppose that $\varrho : \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1 \to \mathcal{A}''$ is bijective. Then any two of the following statements imply the third:*

(i) $\kappa : [\pi_1] \otimes \cdots \otimes [\pi_s] \to A(\mathcal{A})$ *is an isomorphism of graded $\mathbb{K}$-vector spaces;*

(ii) $\kappa' : [\pi_1'] \otimes \cdots \otimes [\pi_s'] \to A(\mathcal{A}')$ *is an isomorphism of graded $\mathbb{K}$-vector spaces;*

(iii) $\kappa'' : [\pi_2''] \otimes \cdots \otimes [\pi_s''] \to A(\mathcal{A}'')$ *is an isomorphism of graded $\mathbb{K}$-vector spaces.*

Theorem 1.4 is an immediate consequence of Terao's Theorem 2.16 and the following result which is an analogue of Terao's celebrated Addition-Deletion Theorem 2.6 for free arrangements for the class of nice arrangements.

Theorem 1.5. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \neq \Phi_\ell$. Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_s)$ be a partition of $\mathcal{A}$. Let $H_0 \in \pi_1$ and let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ be the triple associated with H_0. Suppose that $\varrho : \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1 \to \mathcal{A}''$ is bijective. Then any two of the following statements imply the third:*

(i) *π is nice for $\mathcal{A}$;*

(ii) *π' is nice for $\mathcal{A}'$;*

(iii) *π'' is nice for $\mathcal{A}''$.*

As indicated above, if $\mathcal{A}$ is supersolvable, then $\mathcal{A}$ satisfies the factorization property from (1.2), so $\mathcal{A}$ is nice. Nevertheless, there is no counterpart of the Addition-Deletion Theorem 1.5 for the stronger notion of supersolvable arrangements, see Example 3.19.

By Terao's *Factorization Theorem* 2.7, the Poincaré polynomial of a free arrangement $\mathcal{A}$ factors into linear terms given by the exponents of $\mathcal{A}$, i.e.

$$\pi(\mathcal{A}, t) = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (1 + b_i t), \tag{1.6}$$

where $\exp \mathcal{A} = \{b_1, \ldots, b_\ell\}$ are the exponents of $\mathcal{A}$, [Ter81] (cf. [OT92, Thm. 4.137]). In view of (1.1), considering both factorizations of the Poincaré polynomials given in (1.3) and (1.6), it is natural to ask whether every nice arrangement is free, [Ter92]. This however is not the case. It was observed by Enta, Falk and Ziegler independently that the 3-arrangement in characteristic 3 in [Z90, Ex. 4.1] is factored but not free (cf. note added in proof in [Ter92]). Vice versa, a free arrangement need not be factored either, e.g. the reflection arrangment of the Coxeter group of type D_4 is free but not factored, see Remark 3.15(ii).

Combining Theorem 1.5 with Terao's Addition-Deletion Theorem 2.6 for free arrangements, we get an Addition-Deletion Theorem for the proper subclass of nice and free arrangements.

Theorem 1.7. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \neq \Phi_\ell$. Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_s)$ be a partition of $\mathcal{A}$. Let $H_0 \in \pi_1$ and let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ be the triple associated with H_0. Suppose that $\varrho : \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1 \to \mathcal{A}''$ is bijective. Then any two of the following statements imply the third:*

(i) *π is nice for $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ is free;*

(ii) *π' is nice for $\mathcal{A}'$ and $\mathcal{A}'$ is free;*

(iii) *π'' is nice for $\mathcal{A}''$ and $\mathcal{A}''$ is free.*

It is worth noting that in Theorem 1.7 we do not need to explicitly impose the containment conditions on the sets of exponents of the arrangements involved, cf. Theorem 2.6. This is a consequence of the presence of the underlying factorizations along with the bijectivity condition on ϱ. We also note that this condition is necessary, see Example 3.3.

Theorems 1.4, 1.5, and 1.7 likely prove to be equally viable for Orlik-Solomon algebras and nice arrangements, as is Terao's Addition-Deletion Theorem 2.6 for free arrangements. In Examples 3.18, 3.19, 3.20, 3.22 and 3.28, we demonstrate the usefulness of these results.

Theorem 1.5 naturally motivates the notion of an inductive factorization, due to Jambu and Paris [JP95]. In our setting an arrangement $\mathcal{A}$ is called *inductively factored* provided there exists a partition π of $\mathcal{A}$ and a hyperplane $H_0 \in \pi_1$ such that for the triple $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ associated with H_0 the induced partition π' of $\mathcal{A}'$ is an inductive factorization, the associated restriction map $\varrho : \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1 \to \mathcal{A}''$ is bijective and the induced partition π'' of $\mathcal{A}''$ is an inductive factorization of $\mathcal{A}''$, see Definition 3.8.

In Proposition 3.14 we show that every inductively factored arrangement is inductively free. It follows that an inductively factored arrangement admits an induction table of inductively free subarrangements. In Remark 3.16, we show that an inductive factorization can be achieved by means of an *induction of factorizations* procedure in form of an *induction table of factorizations* which extends the method of induction of hyperplanes for inductively free arrangements. In Section 3.3, we demonstrate this method with several examples.

Terao [Ter92] showed that every supersolvable arrangement is factored, see Proposition 2.22. Indeed, every supersolvable arrangement is inductively factored, see Proposition 3.11. Moreover, Jambu and Paris showed that each inductively factored arrangement is inductively free, see Proposition 3.14 ([JP95, Prop. 2.2]). Each of these classes of arrangements is properly contained in the other, see Remark 3.33.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we recall the required notions of free, inductively free, supersolvable and nice arrangements mostly taken from [OT92] and [Ter92]. In Section 2.4, we recall the main results from [Ter92].

In Section 3.1 we prove slightly stronger versions of Theorems 1.5 and 1.7.

Subsequently, in Section 3.2, we introduce the notion of an inductively factored arrangement due to Jambu and Paris, [JP95]. In Proposition 3.11, we show that every supersolvable arrangement is inductively factored, and in Proposition 3.14 that every inductively factored arrangement is inductively free. These results in turn are extended to hereditarily inductively factored arrangements in Section 3.4.

In Remark 3.16, we introduce the concept of induction of factorizations for inductively factored arrangements. In Section 3.3, we present applications of our main results.

In Propositions 3.29 and 3.30, we show that factored and inductively factored arrangements are compatible with the product construction for arrangements, as is the case for free, inductively free and supersolvable arrangements, see Propositions 2.5, 2.9, and [HR14, Prop. 2.6],

respectively. Moreover, we extend this compatibility to hereditarily (inductively) factored arrangements in Corollary 3.32.

For general information about arrangements we refer the reader to [OT92].

2. Recollections and Preliminaries

2.1. **Hyperplane Arrangements.** Let $V = \mathbb{K}^\ell$ be an ℓ-dimensional $\mathbb{K}$-vector space. A *hyperplane arrangement* is a pair $(\mathcal{A}, V)$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is a finite collection of hyperplanes in V. Usually, we simply write $\mathcal{A}$ in place of $(\mathcal{A}, V)$. We write $|\mathcal{A}|$ for the number of hyperplanes in $\mathcal{A}$. The empty arrangement in V is denoted by Φ_ℓ.

The *lattice* $L(\mathcal{A})$ of $\mathcal{A}$ is the set of subspaces of V of the form $H_1 \cap \cdots \cap H_i$ where $\{H_1, \ldots, H_i\}$ is a subset of $\mathcal{A}$. For $X \in L(\mathcal{A})$, we have two associated arrangements, firstly the subarrangement $\mathcal{A}_X := \{H \in \mathcal{A} \mid X \subseteq H\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ and secondly, the *restriction of* $\mathcal{A}$ *to* X, $(\mathcal{A}^X, X)$, where $\mathcal{A}^X := \{X \cap H \mid H \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_X\}$. Note that V belongs to $L(\mathcal{A})$ as the intersection of the empty collection of hyperplanes and $\mathcal{A}^V = \mathcal{A}$. The lattice $L(\mathcal{A})$ is a partially ordered set by reverse inclusion: $X \leq Y$ provided $Y \subseteq X$ for $X, Y \in L(\mathcal{A})$.

If $0 \in H$ for each H in $\mathcal{A}$, then $\mathcal{A}$ is called *central*. If $\mathcal{A}$ is central, then the *center* $T_\mathcal{A} := \cap_{H \in \mathcal{A}} H$ of $\mathcal{A}$ is the unique maximal element in $L(\mathcal{A})$ with respect to the partial order. We have a *rank* function on $L(\mathcal{A})$: $r(X) := \operatorname{codim}_V(X)$. The *rank* $r := r(\mathcal{A})$ of $\mathcal{A}$ is the rank of a maximal element in $L(\mathcal{A})$. The ℓ-arrangement $\mathcal{A}$ is *essential* provided $r(\mathcal{A}) = \ell$. If $\mathcal{A}$ is central and essential, then $T_\mathcal{A} = \{0\}$. Throughout, we only consider central arrangements.

The *Poincaré polynomial* $\pi(\mathcal{A}, t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$ of $\mathcal{A}$ is defined by

$$\pi(\mathcal{A}, t) := \sum_{X \in L(\mathcal{A})} \mu(X)(-t)^{r(X)},$$

where μ is the Möbius function of $L(\mathcal{A})$, see [OT92, Def. 2.48].

Let $S = S(V^*)$ be the symmetric algebra of the dual space V^* of V. If $x_1, \ldots, x_\ell$ is a basis of V^*, then we identify S with the polynomial ring $\mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_\ell]$. For $H \in \mathcal{A}$ we fix $\alpha_H \in V^*$ with $H = \ker \alpha_H$. The *defining polynomial* $Q(\mathcal{A})$ of $\mathcal{A}$ is given by $Q(\mathcal{A}) := \prod_{H \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_H \in S$.

For $\mathcal{A} \neq \Phi_\ell$, let $H_0 \in \mathcal{A}$. Define $\mathcal{A}' := \mathcal{A} \setminus \{H_0\}$, and $\mathcal{A}'' := \mathcal{A}^{H_0} = \{H_0 \cap H \mid H \in \mathcal{A}'\}$. Then $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ is a *triple* of arrangements, [OT92, Def. 1.14].

The *product* $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2, V_1 \oplus V_2)$ of two arrangements $(\mathcal{A}_1, V_1), (\mathcal{A}_2, V_2)$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2 := \{H_1 \oplus V_2 \mid H_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1\} \cup \{V_1 \oplus H_2 \mid H_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2\}, \tag{2.1}$$

see [OT92, Def. 2.13]. In particular, $|\mathcal{A}| = |\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{A}_2|$.

Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$ be a product. By [OT92, Prop. 2.14], there is a lattice isomorphism

$$L(\mathcal{A}_1) \times L(\mathcal{A}_2) \cong L(\mathcal{A}) \quad \text{by} \quad (X_1, X_2) \mapsto X_1 \oplus X_2. \tag{2.2}$$

Using (2.1), it is easily seen that for $X = X_1 \oplus X_2 \in L(\mathcal{A})$, we have

$$\mathcal{A}_X = (\mathcal{A}_1)_{X_1} \times (\mathcal{A}_2)_{X_2} \tag{2.3}$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}^X = \mathcal{A}_1^{X_1} \times \mathcal{A}_2^{X_2}. \tag{2.4}$$

2.2. **Free and inductively free Arrangements.** Free arrangements play a crucial role in the theory of arrangements; see [OT92, §4] for the definition and basic properties. If $\mathcal{A}$ is free, then we can associate with $\mathcal{A}$ the multiset of its *exponents*, denoted $\exp \mathcal{A}$.

Owing to [OT92, Prop. 4.28], free arrangements behave well with respect to the product construction.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ be two arrangements. Then $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$ is free if and only if both $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are free and in that case $\exp \mathcal{A} = \{\exp \mathcal{A}_1, \exp \mathcal{A}_2\}$.*

Terao's celebrated *Addition-Deletion Theorem* [Ter80] plays a fundamental role in the study of free arrangements, [OT92, Thm. 4.51].

Theorem 2.6. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \neq \Phi_\ell$. Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ be a triple of arrangements. Then any two of the following statements imply the third:*

(i) *$\mathcal{A}$ is free with $\exp \mathcal{A} = \{b_1, \ldots, b_{\ell-1}, b_\ell\}$;*

(ii) *$\mathcal{A}'$ is free with $\exp \mathcal{A}' = \{b_1, \ldots, b_{\ell-1}, b_\ell - 1\}$;*

(iii) *$\mathcal{A}''$ is free with $\exp \mathcal{A}'' = \{b_1, \ldots, b_{\ell-1}\}$.*

Terao's *Factorization Theorem* [Ter81] shows that the Poincaré polynomial of a free arrangement $\mathcal{A}$ factors into linear terms given by the exponents of $\mathcal{A}$ (cf. [OT92, Thm. 4.137]):

Theorem 2.7. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is free with $\exp \mathcal{A} = \{b_1, \ldots, b_\ell\}$. Then*

$$\pi(\mathcal{A}, t) = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (1 + b_i t).$$

Theorem 2.6 motivates the notion of an *inductively free* arrangement, [OT92, Def. 4.53].

Definition 2.8. The class $\mathcal{IF}$ of *inductively free* arrangements is the smallest class of arrangements subject to

(i) $\Phi_\ell \in \mathcal{IF}$ for each $\ell \geq 0$;

(ii) if there exists a hyperplane $H_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ such that both $\mathcal{A}'$ and $\mathcal{A}''$ belong to $\mathcal{IF}$, and $\exp \mathcal{A}'' \subseteq \exp \mathcal{A}'$, then $\mathcal{A}$ also belongs to $\mathcal{IF}$.

In [HR15, Prop. 2.10], we showed that the compatibility of products with free arrangements from Proposition 2.5 restricts to inductively free arrangements.

Proposition 2.9. *Let $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ be two arrangements. Then $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$ is inductively free if and only if both $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are inductively free and in that case $\exp \mathcal{A} = \{\exp \mathcal{A}_1, \exp \mathcal{A}_2\}$.*

Following [OT92, Def. 4.140], we say that $\mathcal{A}$ is *hereditarily free* provided $\mathcal{A}^X$ is free for every $X \in L(\mathcal{A})$. In general, a free arrangement need not be hereditarily free, [OT92, Ex. 4.141].

2.3. **Supersolvable Arrangements.** Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an arrangement. Following [OT92, §2], we say that $X \in L(\mathcal{A})$ is *modular* provided $X + Y \in L(\mathcal{A})$ for every $Y \in L(\mathcal{A})$, cf. [OT92, Def. 2.32, Cor. 2.26]. The following notion is due to Stanley [Sta72].

Definition 2.10. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a central arrangement of rank r. We say that $\mathcal{A}$ is *supersolvable* provided there is a maximal chain

$$V = X_0 < X_1 < \ldots < X_{r-1} < X_r = T_{\mathcal{A}}$$

of modular elements X_i in $L(\mathcal{A})$.

Remark 2.11. By [OT92, Ex. 2.28], V, $T_{\mathcal{A}}$ and the members in $\mathcal{A}$ are always modular in $L(\mathcal{A})$. It follows that all 0- 1-, and 2-arrangements are supersolvable.

Note that supersolvable arrangements are inductively free, [OT92, Thm. 4.58].

2.4. **Nice Arrangements.** The notion of a *nice* or *factored* arrangement goes back to Terao [Ter92]. It generalizes the concept of a supersolvable arrangement, see Proposition 2.22. We recall the relevant notions and results from [Ter92] (cf. [OT92, §2.3]).

Definition 2.12. Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_s)$ be a partition of $\mathcal{A}$. Then π is called *independent*, provided for any choice $H_i \in \pi_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$, the resulting s hyperplanes are linearly independent, i.e. $r(H_1 \cap \ldots \cap H_s) = s$.

Definition 2.13. Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_s)$ be a partition of $\mathcal{A}$ and let $X \in L(\mathcal{A})$. The *induced partition* π_X of $\mathcal{A}_X$ is given by the non-empty blocks of the form $\pi_i \cap \mathcal{A}_X$.

Definition 2.14. The partition π of $\mathcal{A}$ is *nice* for $\mathcal{A}$ or a *factorization* of $\mathcal{A}$ provided

(i) π is independent, and

(ii) for each $X \in L(\mathcal{A}) \backslash \{V\}$, the induced partition π_X admits a block which is a singleton.

If $\mathcal{A}$ admits a factorization, then we also say that $\mathcal{A}$ is *factored* or *nice*.

Remark 2.15. (i). Vacuously, the empty partition is nice for the empty arrangement Φ_ℓ.

(ii). If $\mathcal{A} \neq \Phi_\ell$, π is a nice partition of $\mathcal{A}$ and $X \in L(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \{V\}$, then the non-empty parts of the induced partition π_X in turn form a nice partition of $\mathcal{A}_X$; cf. the proof of [Ter92, Cor. 2.11]

(iii). Since the singleton condition in Definition 2.14(ii) also applies to the center $T_{\mathcal{A}}$ of $L(\mathcal{A})$, a factorization π of $\mathcal{A} \neq \Phi_\ell$ always admits a singleton as one of its parts. Also note that for a hyperplane, the singleton condition trivially holds.

(iv). Usually, when $\mathcal{A}$ is factored, there is more than one nice partition. However, there are instances when $\mathcal{A}$ admits a unique nice partition, see Example 3.22.

We recall the main results from [Ter92] (cf. [OT92, §3.3]) that motivated Definition 2.14.

Theorem 2.16. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a central ℓ-arrangement and let $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_s)$ be a partition of $\mathcal{A}$. Then the $\mathbb{K}$-linear map κ defined in (1.2) is an isomorphism of graded $\mathbb{K}$-vector spaces if and only if π is nice for $\mathcal{A}$.*

Corollary 2.17. *Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_s)$ be a factorization of $\mathcal{A}$. Then the following hold:*

(i) *$s = r = r(\mathcal{A})$ and*

$$\mathrm{Poin}(A(\mathcal{A}), t) = \prod_{i=1}^{r} (1 + |\pi_i| t);$$

(ii) *the multiset $\{|\pi_1|, \dots, |\pi_r|\}$ only depends on $\mathcal{A}$;*

(iii) *for any $X \in L(\mathcal{A})$, we have*

$$r(X) = |\{i \mid \pi_i \cap \mathcal{A}_X \neq \varnothing\}|.$$

Remark 2.18. It follows from (1.1) and Corollary 2.17 that the question whether $\mathcal{A}$ is factored is a purely combinatorial property and only depends on the lattice $L(\mathcal{A})$.

Remark 2.19. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is free of rank r. Then $\mathcal{A} = \Phi_{\ell - r} \times \mathcal{A}_0$, where $\mathcal{A}_0$ is an essential, free r-arrangement (cf. [OT92, §3.2]), and so, thanks to Proposition 2.5, $\exp \mathcal{A} = \{0^{\ell - r}, \exp \mathcal{A}_0\}$. Suppose that $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_r)$ is a nice partition of $\mathcal{A}$. Then by the factorization properties of the Poincaré polynomials for free and factored arrangements, Theorem 2.7, respectively Corollary 2.17(i) and (1.1) we have

$$\exp \mathcal{A} = \{0^{\ell - r}, |\pi_1|, \dots, |\pi_r|\}. \tag{2.20}$$

In particular, if $\mathcal{A}$ is essential, then

$$\exp \mathcal{A} = \{|\pi_1|, \dots, |\pi_\ell|\}. \tag{2.21}$$

Finally, we record [Ter92, Ex. 2.4], which shows that nice arrangements generalize supersolvable ones (cf. [OST84, Thm. 5.3], [J90, Prop. 3.2.2], [OT92, Prop. 2.67, Thm. 3.81]).

Proposition 2.22. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a central, supersolvable arrangement of rank r. Let*

$$V = X_0 < X_1 < \ldots < X_{r-1} < X_r = T_{\mathcal{A}}$$

be a maximal chain of modular elements in $L(\mathcal{A})$. Define $\pi_i = \mathcal{A}_{X_i} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{X_{i-1}}$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Then $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_r)$ is a nice partition of $\mathcal{A}$. In particular, the $\mathbb{K}$-linear map κ defined in (1.2) is an isomorphism of graded $\mathbb{K}$-vector spaces.

3. Factored and inductively factored Arrangements

3.1. **Restriction, Addition and Deletion for nice Arrangements.** In our main result, Theorem 3.5, we prove an analogue for nice arrangements of Terao's seminal Addition-Deletion Theorem 2.6 for free arrangements. Following Jambu and Paris [JP95], we introduce further notation.

Definition 3.1. Suppose $\mathcal{A} \neq \Phi_\ell$. Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_s)$ be a partition of $\mathcal{A}$. Let $H_0 \in \pi_1$ and let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ be the triple associated with H_0. We say that H_0 is *distinguished (with respect to π)* provided π induces a factorization π' of $\mathcal{A}'$, i.e. the non-empty subsets $\pi_i \cap \mathcal{A}'$ form a nice partition of $\mathcal{A}'$. Note that since $H_0 \in \pi_1$, we have $\pi_i \cap \mathcal{A}' = \pi_i \neq \varnothing$ for $i = 2, \dots, s$.

Also, associated with π and H_0, we define the *restriction map*

$$\varrho := \varrho_{\pi, H_0} : \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1 \to \mathcal{A}'' \text{ given by } H \mapsto H \cap H_0$$

and set

$$\pi_i'' := \varrho(\pi_i) = \{H \cap H_0 \mid H \in \pi_i\} \quad \text{for} \quad 2 \leq i \leq s.$$

In general, ϱ need not be surjective nor injective. However, since we are only concerned with cases when $\pi'' = (\pi_2'', \ldots, \pi_s'')$ is a partition of $\mathcal{A}''$, ϱ has to be onto and $\varrho(\pi_i) \cap \varrho(\pi_j) = \varnothing$ for $i \neq j$. As we shall see, the natural condition for us is the injectivity of ϱ.

Remark 3.2. Our definitions of a distinguished hyperplane and of the restriction map ϱ in Definition 3.1 differ from the one by Jambu and Paris [JP95, §2], in that we do not require the underlying partition to be a factorization of $\mathcal{A}$. This more general setting is crucial for the purpose of the "Addition" statement in Theorem 3.5 below, as here we want to deduce that π is nice for $\mathcal{A}$. This comes at the expense of having to impose bijectivity for ϱ.

These more general notions are clearly feasible, as shown by the following example.

Example 3.3. Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{D}_2^2$ be the reflection arrangement of the Coxeter group of type B_2, cf. [JT84, Ex. 2.6]. Then $\mathcal{A}$ has defining polynomial $Q(\mathcal{A}) = xy(x^2 - y^2)$. While independent, the partition $\pi = (\{\ker x, \ker(x-y)\}, \{\ker y, \ker(x+y)\})$ is obviously not nice for $\mathcal{A}$, as none of its parts is a singleton, cf. Remark 2.15(iii). However, for any choice of hyperplane $H_0 \in \mathcal{A}$, the induced partitions π' of $\mathcal{A}'$ and π'' of $\mathcal{A}''$ are factorizations, but ϱ is never injective. Nevertheless, as a 2-arrangment, $\mathcal{A}$ is of course factored, cf. Remark 3.12.

Using the notation and terminology introduced in Definition 3.1, the following result by Jambu and Paris gives the "*Restriction*" part of the Addition-Deletion Theorem 3.5 below.

Proposition 3.4 ([JP95, Prop. 2.1])**.** *Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \neq \Phi_\ell$ has rank r. Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_r)$ be a factorization of $\mathcal{A}$. Let $H_0 \in \pi_1$ and let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ be the triple associated with H_0. Suppose H_0 is distinguished with respect to π. Then the restriction map $\varrho : \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1 \to \mathcal{A}''$ is a bijection and the induced partition $\pi'' = (\pi_2'', \ldots, \pi_r'')$ is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}''$.*

Proof. Let $X \in \mathcal{A}''$. Viewing X as a member of $L(\mathcal{A})$, we have $r(X) = 2$. It follows from Corollary 2.17(iii) that there is an $H \in \pi_k \cap \mathcal{A}_X$ for some $k > 1$. Thus $\varrho(H) = X$, and so ϱ is onto. Suppose $H, H' \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1$ so that $H_0 \cap H = X = H_0 \cap H'$. Again since $r(X) = 2$ and $H_0 \in \pi_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_X$, we have $H, H' \in \pi_k$ for some $k > 1$, by Corollary 2.17(iii). In particular, $H \cap H'$ belongs to $L(\mathcal{A}')$. Since π' is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}'$, $\pi'_{H \cap H'}$ has to admit a singleton as one of its parts, say $\pi_j' \cap \mathcal{A}'_{H \cap H'} = \{K\}$. If $j = 1$, then $K \neq H_0$ and so $|\pi_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_X| \geq 2$. Consequently, the singleton of π_X has to be $\pi_k \cap \mathcal{A}_X$ and thus $H = H'$. If $j > 1$, then $\pi_j' \cap \mathcal{A}'_{H \cap H'} = \pi_j \cap \mathcal{A}_{H \cap H'}$, and so $j = k$ and again $H = H'$. In any event, ϱ is bijective.

Let $H_i \in \pi_i$ for $i = 2, \ldots, r$. Then $r(H_0 \cap H_2 \cap \ldots \cap H_r) = r$, since π is independent. Thus $r((H_0 \cap H_2) \cap \ldots \cap (H_0 \cap H_r)) = r - 1$ in $L(\mathcal{A}'')$, and so π'' is independent.

Let $X \in L(\mathcal{A}'')$ and $X \neq H_0$. Viewing X as a member of $L(\mathcal{A})$, since π is a factorization, there is a part π_k of π so that $\pi_k \cap \mathcal{A}_X = \{H\}$. If $k > 1$, then $H \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1$ and so $\pi_k'' \cap \mathcal{A}_X'' = \{H \cap H_0\}$.

Now suppose that $k = 1$. Then, since $H_0 \in \pi_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_X$, we must have $H = H_0$, i.e. $\pi_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_X = \{H_0\}$. Write $X = H_0 \cap Y$, where $Y = L_1 \cap \ldots \cap L_m$ for $L_i \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1$.

If $X = Y$, then $X \in L(\mathcal{A}')$. Thus, since π' is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}'$, there is a part π'_j of π' so that $\pi'_j \cap \mathcal{A}'_X = \{K\}$. Since $K \neq H_0$ and $\pi_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_X = \{H_0\}$, we must have $j > 1$ and so $K \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1$. Therefore, $\pi_j \cap \mathcal{A}_X = \pi'_j \cap \mathcal{A}'_X = \{K\}$ and so $\pi''_j \cap \mathcal{A}''_X = \{K \cap H_0\}$. Finally, if $X \neq Y$, then $r(X) = r(Y) + 1$ and thus $\pi_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_Y = \varnothing$, thanks to Corollary 2.17(iii). Thus, since $\pi_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_X = \{H_0\}$, we have $\mathcal{A}_X = \mathcal{A}_Y \cup \{H_0\}$. As π is a factorization, there is an index $j > 1$ such that $\pi_j \cap \mathcal{A}_Y = \{L\}$. Since $\mathcal{A}_X = \mathcal{A}_Y \cup \{H_0\}$ and $j > 1$, we have

$$\{L\} = \pi_j \cap \mathcal{A}_Y = \pi_j \cap \mathcal{A}_X.$$

It follows that $\pi''_j \cap \mathcal{A}''_X = \{L \cap H_0\}$, as required. □

Here is our analogue for nice arrangements of Terao's Addition-Deletion Theorem 2.6 for free arrangements.

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \neq \Phi_\ell$ has rank r. Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_s)$ be a partition of $\mathcal{A}$. Let $H_0 \in \pi_1$ and let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ be the triple associated with H_0. Then any two of the following statements imply the third:*

(i) *π is nice for $\mathcal{A}$;*

(ii) *π' is nice for $\mathcal{A}'$;*

(iii) *$\varrho : \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1 \to \mathcal{A}''$ is bijective and π'' is nice for $\mathcal{A}''$.*

Proof. If (i) and (ii) hold, then so does (iii), by Proposition 3.4.

For "*Addition*", assume (ii) and (iii). We need to show that π is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}$. As remarked in Definition 3.1, if ϱ is injective and π'' is a partition of $\mathcal{A}''$, then ϱ is bijective.

By (ii), π' is already independent. Let $H_i \in \pi_i$ for $i = 2, \ldots, s$. Set $X = H_0 \cap H_2 \cap \ldots \cap H_s$. Then $X = (H_0 \cap H_2) \cap (H_0 \cap H_3) \cap \ldots \cap (H_0 \cap H_s) \in L(\mathcal{A}'')$. Since $H_i \in \pi_i$, we have $H_0 \cap H_i \in \pi''_i$, for $i = 2, \ldots, s$. By (iii), π'' is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}''$, so the rank of X as a member of $L(\mathcal{A}'')$ is $r - 1$, by Corollary 2.17(i) applied to $\mathcal{A}''$, and thus the rank of X in $L(\mathcal{A})$ is r, and so in particular, $s = r$ and π is independent.

Let $X \in L(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \{V\}$. We need to show that π_X admits a singleton as one of its parts. If $X \in \mathcal{A}$ is a hyperplane, this is obvious. So we may assume that $r(X) > 1$.

If $H_0 \notin \mathcal{A}_X$, then $\mathcal{A}_X = \mathcal{A}'_X$ and $X \in L(\mathcal{A}') \setminus \{V\}$. Since π' is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}'$, there is an index k such that $\pi'_k \cap \mathcal{A}'_X = \{H\}$. Therefore, since $H \neq H_0$ and $\mathcal{A}_X = \mathcal{A}'_X$,

$$\pi_k \cap \mathcal{A}_X = \pi_k \cap \mathcal{A}'_X = \pi'_k \cap \mathcal{A}'_X = \{H\}$$

is a singleton.

Now suppose that $H_0 \in \mathcal{A}_X$. Since ϱ is surjective, there are $L_1, \ldots, L_m \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1$ with $\mathcal{A}''_X = \{H_0 \cap L_1, \ldots, H_0 \cap L_m\}$. Since π'' is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}''$, there is a k so that $\pi''_k \cap \mathcal{A}''_X = \{H_0 \cap L_i\}$ for some i. Since ϱ is injective it follows that $\pi_k \cap \mathcal{A}_X = \{L_i\}$ is a singleton. Consequently, π is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}$, as claimed.

Finally, for the "*Deletion*" part, suppose that (i) and (iii) hold. We need to show that π' is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}'$. Clearly, π' is independent, since π is.

Let $X \in L(\mathcal{A}') \setminus \{V\}$. We may also assume that $X \notin \mathcal{A}'$. Then $X \in L(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \{V\}$. Since π is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}$, there is an index k so that $\pi_k \cap \mathcal{A}_X = \{H\}$ is a singleton. If $H_0 \notin \mathcal{A}_X$, then $H \neq H_0$ and so $H \in \mathcal{A}'_X$. Therefore,

$$\{H\} \subseteq \pi'_k \cap \mathcal{A}'_X \subseteq \pi_k \cap \mathcal{A}_X = \{H\}.$$

So $\pi'_k \cap \mathcal{A}'_X$ is a singleton.

Now suppose that $H_0 \in \mathcal{A}_X$, so that $X \subset H_0$. Then again $X = H_0 \cap K_1 \cap \ldots \cap K_m$ for some hyperplanes $K_i \in \mathcal{A}$. Thus $X = (H_0 \cap K_1) \cap (H_0 \cap K_2) \cap \ldots \cap (H_0 \cap K_m) \in L(\mathcal{A}'')$. Because $\varrho : \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1 \to \mathcal{A}''$ is surjective, there are hyperplanes $L_i \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1$ such that $H_0 \cap L_i = H_0 \cap K_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$. So $X = (H_0 \cap L_1) \cap (H_0 \cap L_2) \cap \ldots \cap (H_0 \cap L_m)$. Since π'' is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}''$, there is a k so that $\pi''_k \cap \mathcal{A}''_X = \{H_0 \cap L_i\}$. By construction, $k > 1$, $L_i \in \pi_k = \pi'_k$ and $L_i \in \mathcal{A}'$. Thus, since ϱ is injective, it follows that

$$\{L_i\} = \pi_k \cap \mathcal{A}_X = \pi'_k \cap \mathcal{A}'_X.$$

So again, $\pi'_k \cap \mathcal{A}'_X$ is a singleton. Consequently, π' is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}'$, as claimed. □

Theorem 1.5 is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.5.

As nice arrangements need not be free and vice versa, combining Theorems 2.6 and 3.5 yields an Addition-Deletion Theorem for the subclass of arrangements that are both nice and free.

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \neq \Phi_\ell$ has rank r. Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_s)$ be a partition of $\mathcal{A}$. Let $H_0 \in \pi_1$ and let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ be the triple associated with H_0. Then any two of the following statements imply the third:*

(i) *π is nice for $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ is free;*

(ii) *π' is nice for $\mathcal{A}'$ and $\mathcal{A}'$ is free;*

(iii) *π'' is nice for $\mathcal{A}''$ and $\mathcal{A}''$ is free with* $\exp \mathcal{A}'' = \{0^{\ell-r}, |\pi_2|, \ldots, |\pi_r|\}$.

Proof. By (2.20), we have $\exp \mathcal{A} = \{0^{\ell-r}, |\pi_1|, \ldots, |\pi_r|\}$, $\exp \mathcal{A}' = \{0^{\ell-r}, |\pi_1| - 1, \ldots, |\pi_r|\}$, and $\exp \mathcal{A}'' = \{0^{\ell-r}, |\pi''_2|, \ldots, |\pi''_r|\}$, in (i), (ii) and (iii), respectively. In addition, in (iii), since $|\pi_i| \geq |\varrho(\pi_i)| = |\pi''_i|$ and $\exp \mathcal{A}'' = \{0^{\ell-r}, |\pi_2|, \ldots, |\pi_r|\}$, it follows that $|\pi_i| = |\pi''_i|$, for each $i = 2, \ldots, r$ and so $\varrho : \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1 \to \mathcal{A}''$ is bijective. The result now follows from Theorems 2.6 and 3.5. □

We obtain Theorem 1.7 as a variation of Theorem 3.6; the requirements on the exponents needed for Theorem 2.6 follow from Remark 2.19.

Remark 3.7. The injectivity condition on ϱ in Theorem 3.5(iii) and the requirement on the exponents of $\mathcal{A}''$ in Theorem 3.6(iii) (likewise the injectivity condition on ϱ in Theorems 1.5 and 1.7) are necessary. Else both the "Addition" and "Deletion" statements in each of the theorems are wrong, see Examples 3.3 and 3.20, respectively.

3.2. **Inductively factored Arrangements.** The Addition-Deletion Theorem 3.5 for nice arrangements motivates the following stronger notion of factorization, cf. [JP95].

Definition 3.8. The class $\mathcal{IFAC}$ of *inductively factored* arrangements is the smallest class of pairs $(\mathcal{A}, \pi)$ of arrangements $\mathcal{A}$ together with a partition π subject to

(i) $(\Phi_\ell, (\varnothing)) \in \mathcal{IFAC}$ for each $\ell \geq 0$;

(ii) if there exists a partition π of $\mathcal{A}$ and a hyperplane $H_0 \in \pi_1$ such that for the triple $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ associated with H_0 the restriction map $\varrho = \varrho_{\pi, H_0} : \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1 \to \mathcal{A}''$ is bijective and for the induced partitions π' of $\mathcal{A}'$ and π'' of $\mathcal{A}''$ both $(\mathcal{A}', \pi')$ and $(\mathcal{A}'', \pi'')$ belong to $\mathcal{IFAC}$, then $(\mathcal{A}, \pi)$ also belongs to $\mathcal{IFAC}$.

If $(\mathcal{A}, \pi)$ is in $\mathcal{IFAC}$, then we say that $\mathcal{A}$ is *inductively factored with respect to* π, or else that π is an *inductive factorization* of $\mathcal{A}$. Sometimes, we simply say $\mathcal{A}$ is *inductively factored* without reference to a specific inductive factorization of $\mathcal{A}$.

Remark 3.9. Our Definition 3.8 of inductively factored arrangements differs from the one given by Jambu and Paris [JP95] in that, apart from the mere technicalities of incorporating empty arrangements and for defining $\mathcal{IFAC}$ for pairs of arrangements and partitions rather than for partitions of arrangements, in part (ii) we do not assume from the outset that π is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}$. This is possible by virtue of the Addition-Deletion Theorem 3.5. However, this comes at the cost of the bijectivity requirement for the associated restriction map ϱ; cf. Remark 3.7.

In view of Proposition 3.4 it is desirable to have an easy condition that ensures the existence of a distinguished hyperplane with respect to a given factorization π of $\mathcal{A}$. Our next observation shows that a modular element in $L(\mathcal{A})$ of rank $r-1$ which is compatible with a given factorization π of $\mathcal{A}$ gives such a condition. While sufficient, the presence of such a modular element is not necessary for the existence of a distinguished hyperplane, see Example 3.19.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_r)$ be a factorization of $\mathcal{A}$. Suppose $Z \in L(\mathcal{A})$ is modular of rank $r-1$ so that $\pi_1 = \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_Z$. Then any $H \in \pi_1$ is distinguished with respect to π. In particular, $\varrho : \mathcal{A}_Z \to \mathcal{A}''$ is bijective.*

Proof. Let $H_0 \in \pi_1$ and let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ be the triple with respect to H_0. We have to show that π' is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}'$. Since π is independent, clearly so is π'.

Let $X \in L(\mathcal{A}') \setminus \{V\}$. Then X also belongs to $L(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \{V\}$. Since Z is modular, $X + Z \in L(\mathcal{A})$. First suppose that $X + Z = V$. Then $r(X \cap Z) = r$, as $Z \not\subseteq X$. Since Z is modular, it follows from [OT92, Lem. 2.24] that $1 \leq r(X) = r(X \cap Z) + r(X + Z) - r(Z) = r + 0 - (r-1)$. Thus $r(X) = 1$ and so X is a hyperplane in $\mathcal{A}'$. In particular, $X \neq H_0$ and $\mathcal{A}'_X = \{X\}$. Thus there is a part π'_k of π' so that $\pi'_k \cap \mathcal{A}'_X = \{X\}$ is a singleton.

Now suppose that $X + Z \neq V$. Since $X + Z$ belongs to $L(\mathcal{A})$, there is a block π_k of π such that $\pi_k \cap \mathcal{A}_{X+Z}$ is a singleton. Because $\mathcal{A}_{X+Z} = \mathcal{A}_X \cap \mathcal{A}_Z$ and $\pi_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_Z = \varnothing$, we must have $k > 1$ and so, $H_0 \notin \pi_k = \pi'_k$ and $\pi_k = \pi_k \cap \mathcal{A}_Z$. It follows that

$$\pi'_k \cap \mathcal{A}'_X = \pi_k \cap \mathcal{A}_X = \pi_k \cap \mathcal{A}_Z \cap \mathcal{A}_X = \pi_k \cap \mathcal{A}_{X+Z}$$

is a singleton, as required. The final statement on ϱ follows from Proposition 3.4. □

Note, the presence of the modular element Z in Lemma 3.10 implies that the bijective map $\varrho : \mathcal{A}_Z \to \mathcal{A}''$ induces an isomorphism of the corresponding Orlik-Solomon algebras: $A(\mathcal{A}_Z) \cong A(\mathcal{A}'')$, cf. [OST84, Lem. 5.1], [OT92, Lem. 3.79].

As an application of Lemma 3.10, we can strengthen Proposition 2.22 (this is already stated in [JP95] without proof). Note, the converse of Proposition 3.11 is false, see Example 3.19.

Proposition 3.11. *If $\mathcal{A}$ is supersolvable, then $\mathcal{A}$ is inductively factored.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is supersolvable and let $V = X_0 < X_1 < \ldots < X_{r-1} < X_r = T_{\mathcal{A}}$ be a maximal chain of modular elements X_i in $L(\mathcal{A})$. Define $\pi_i = \mathcal{A}_{X_i} \setminus \mathcal{A}_{X_{i-1}}$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Then $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_r)$ is nice for $\mathcal{A}$, by Proposition 2.22.

We prove that π is an inductive factorization of $\mathcal{A}$ by induction on $n = |\mathcal{A}|$. If $\mathcal{A} = \Phi_\ell$, there is nothing to show. So suppose that $n > 0$ and that the result holds for all supersolvable arrangements with less than n hyperplanes.

Let $H_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ be a complement of X_{r-1} in V and let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ be the triple with respect to H_0. It follows from Lemma 3.10 and Proposition 3.4 that π' is nice for $\mathcal{A}'$, $\varrho : \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_r \to \mathcal{A}''$ is bijective, and π'' is nice for $\mathcal{A}''$.

Thanks to [OT92, Lem. 2.62(1)], $\mathcal{A}''$ is supersolvable and π'' is the nice partition afforded by the maximal chain of modular elements in $L(\mathcal{A}'')$ induced by the given maximal chain in $L(\mathcal{A})$ above. Since $|\mathcal{A}''| < n$, it follows from our induction hypothesis that π'' is an inductive factorization of $\mathcal{A}''$. Likewise, by [OT92, Lem. 2.62(2)], $\mathcal{A}'$ is supersolvable and π' is the nice partition stemming from the maximal chain of modular elements in $L(\mathcal{A}')$ induced by the given maximal chain in $L(\mathcal{A})$ above. (Note that it might be the case that $r(\mathcal{A}') = r(\mathcal{A}) - 1$.) Since $|\mathcal{A}'| < n$, it follows from our induction hypothesis that π' is an inductive factorization of $\mathcal{A}'$. Thus, by Definition 3.8, π is an inductive factorization of $\mathcal{A}$, as desired. □

Remark 3.12. Since any 1- and 2-arrangement is supersolvable, by Remark 2.11, each such is inductively factored, by Proposition 3.11.

In contrast to 2-arrangements, a 3-arrangement need not be factored. It is easily seen that a 3-arrangement with at most 3 hyperplanes is always inductively factored. However, already with 4 hyperplanes it need not even be factored, as our next example shows.

Example 3.13. One easily checks that the 3-arrangement $\mathcal{A}$ with defining polynomial $Q(\mathcal{A}) = xyz(x + y - z)$ does not admit a nice partition; neither is it free, see [OT92, Ex. 4.34]. This is the smallest such example. Simply by adding only one additional hyperplane we obtain an inductively factored arrangement, see Example 3.18.

The similarity of Definitions 2.8 and 3.8 is not a coincidence. Indeed, Jambu and Paris showed that inductively factored arrangements are inductively free [JP95, Prop. 2.2]. (Jambu and Paris only claimed freeness but their proof actually does give the stronger result.)

Proposition 3.14. *Let $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_r)$ be an inductive factorization of $\mathcal{A}$. Then $\mathcal{A}$ is inductively free with exponents* $\exp \mathcal{A} = \{0^{\ell-r}, |\pi_1|, \ldots, |\pi_r|\}$.

Proof. We argue by induction on $|\mathcal{A}|$. If $|\mathcal{A}| = 0$, there is nothing to show. So suppose that $|\mathcal{A}| = n > 0$ and that the result holds for all inductively factored arrangements with less than n hyperplanes. Let $H_0 \in \pi_1$ be a distinguished hyperplane with respect to π. Then, by Definition 3.8, π' and π'' are inductive factorizations of $\mathcal{A}'$ and $\mathcal{A}''$. As $|\mathcal{A}'|, |\mathcal{A}''| < n$, it follows from our induction hypothesis that both $\mathcal{A}'$ and $\mathcal{A}''$ are inductively free with exponents $\exp \mathcal{A}' = \{0^{\ell-r}, |\pi_1| - 1, |\pi_2|, \ldots, |\pi_r|\}$ and $\exp \mathcal{A}'' = \{0^{\ell-r}, |\pi_2''|, \ldots, |\pi_r''|\}$. Thanks to Proposition 3.4, $\varrho : \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1 \to \mathcal{A}''$ is bijective, and so $\exp \mathcal{A}'' = \{0^{\ell-r}, |\pi_2|, \ldots, |\pi_r|\}$. Consequently, $\exp \mathcal{A}'' \subset \exp \mathcal{A}'$, and so $\mathcal{A}$ is inductively free. Finally, $\exp \mathcal{A} = \{0^{\ell-r}, |\pi_1|, \ldots, |\pi_r|\}$, by Theorem 2.6. □

Remark 3.15. (i). Owing to Proposition 3.14 and Remark 2.18, the question whether $\mathcal{A}$ is inductively factored is a combinatorial property and only depends on the lattice $L(\mathcal{A})$.

(ii). The converse of Proposition 3.14 is false. Terao has already noted that the reflection arrangement $\mathcal{A}(D_4)$ of the Coxeter group of type D_4 is not factored. But $\mathcal{A}(D_4)$ is inductively free, [JT84, Ex. 2.6].

(iii). It follows from Proposition 3.14 that Ziegler's example [Z90, Ex. 4.1] of a factored 3-arrangement in characteristic 3 is not inductively factored, as it is not free.

(iv). An inductively free and factored arrangement need not be inductively factored, see Example 3.22.

Remark 3.16. (i). If $\mathcal{A}$ is inductively factored, then $\mathcal{A}$ is inductively free, by Proposition 3.14. The latter can be described by a so called *induction table*, cf. [OT92, §4.3, p. 119]. In this process we start with an inductively free arrangement (frequently Φ_ℓ) and add hyperplanes successively ensuring that part (ii) of Definition 2.8 is satisfied. This process is referred to as *induction of hyperplanes*. This procedure amounts to choosing a total order on $\mathcal{A}$, say $\mathcal{A} = \{H_1, \ldots, H_n\}$, so that each of the subarrangements $\mathcal{A}_0 := \Phi_\ell$, $\mathcal{A}_i := \{H_1, \ldots, H_i\}$ and each of the restrictions $\mathcal{A}_i^{H_i}$ is inductively free for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. In the associated induction table we record in the i-th row the information of the i-th step of this process, by listing $\exp \mathcal{A}_i' = \exp \mathcal{A}_{i-1}$, the defining form α_{H_i} of H_i, as well as $\exp \mathcal{A}_i'' = \exp \mathcal{A}_i^{H_i}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

The proof of Proposition 3.14 shows that if π is an inductive factorization of $\mathcal{A}$ and $H_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ is distinguished with respect to π, then the triple $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ with respect to H_0 is a triple of inductively free arrangements. Thus an induction table of $\mathcal{A}$ can be constructed, compatible with suitable inductive factorizations of the subarrangments $\mathcal{A}_i$.

(ii). Now suppose $\mathcal{A}$ is inductively free and let $\mathcal{A} = \{H_1, \ldots, H_n\}$ be a choice of a total order on $\mathcal{A}$, so that each of the subarrangements $\mathcal{A}_0 := \Phi_\ell$, $\mathcal{A}_i := \{H_1, \ldots, H_i\}$ and each of the restrictions $\mathcal{A}_i^{H_i}$ is inductively free for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

Then, starting with the empty partition for Φ_ℓ, we can attempt to build inductive factorizations π_i of $\mathcal{A}_i$ consecutively, resulting in an inductive factorization $\pi = \pi_n$ of $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_n$. This is achieved by invoking Theorem 3.6 repeatedly in order to derive that each π_i is an inductive factorization of $\mathcal{A}_i$. For this it suffices to check the conditions in part (iii) of Theorem 3.6, i.e., that $\exp \mathcal{A}_i''$ is given by the sizes of the parts of π_i not containing H_i and that the induced partition π_i'' of $\mathcal{A}_i''$ is a factorization. The fact that H_i is distinguished with respect to π_i is part of the inductive hypothesis, as $\pi_i' = \pi_{i-1}$ is an inductive factorization of $\mathcal{A}_i' = \mathcal{A}_{i-1}$.

We then add the inductive factorizations π_i of $\mathcal{A}_i$ as additional data into an induction table for $\mathcal{A}$ (or else record to which part of π_{i-1} the new hyperplane H_i is appended to). The data in such an extended induction table together with the "Addition" part of Theorem 3.6 then proves that $\mathcal{A}$ is inductively factored. We refer to this technique as *induction of factorizations* and the corresponding table as an *induction table of factorizations* for $\mathcal{A}$. Note that listing $\exp \mathcal{A}'_i$ and $\exp \mathcal{A}''_i$ in these tables is redundant, as the non-zero exponents are simply given by the cardinalities of the parts of π'_i and π''_i, respectively, cf. (2.20).

We illustrate this induction of factorizations procedure in Tables 1, 2 and 3 in Examples 3.18, 3.19 and 3.28, respectively. As for the usual induction process for free arrangements, induction for factorizations is sensitive to the chosen order on $\mathcal{A}$, cf. Example 3.18.

It is worth noting that when using this inductive technique, we end up showing that $\mathcal{A}$ is inductively factored without knowing *a priori* that $\mathcal{A}$ is factored.

Clearly, if $\mathcal{A}$ is inductively free but not factored, then this induction of factorizations must terminate at a proper subarrangement of $\mathcal{A}$, cf. Remark 3.15(ii).

Remark 3.17. Suppose $\mathcal{A}$ and $H_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ are such that $\mathcal{A}$ is inductively factored but the deletion $\mathcal{A}'$ is not. Suppose that π is a partition of $\mathcal{A}$ such that π' is nice for $\mathcal{A}'$ and that the conditions in Theorem 3.5(iii) are satisfied. Then, by Theorem 3.5, π is nice for $\mathcal{A}$, but it need not be the case that π is an inductive factorization of $\mathcal{A}$. We present such an instance in the second part of Example 3.20.

3.3. **Applications and Examples.** In our first example we illustrate how to construct an induction table of factorizations as outlined in Remark 3.16(ii). This example also shows that the order of hyperplanes matters.

Example 3.18. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the 3-arrangement with defining polynomial

$$Q(\mathcal{A}) = xyz(x+y)(x+y-z).$$

It follows from [OT92, Ex. 4.54] that $\mathcal{A}$ is inductively free with $\exp \mathcal{A} = \{1, 2, 2\}$. For simplicity, we enumerate the five hyperplanes of $\mathcal{A}$ in the order their linear forms appear as factors in $Q(\mathcal{A})$, i.e. $H_1 = \ker(x), H_2 = \ker(y), \ldots, H_5 = \ker(x+y-z)$. We claim that

$$\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3) = (\{H_1\}, \{H_2, H_4\}, \{H_3, H_5\})$$

is an inductive factorization of $\mathcal{A}$. Using the induction table of $\mathcal{A}$ from [OT92, Table 4.1], we show this using the Addition-Deletion Theorem 3.6 by exhibiting an induction table of factorizations for $\mathcal{A}$ in Table 1. We indicate the corresponding inductive factorizations of $\mathcal{A}'_i$ and $\mathcal{A}''_i$ in the columns headed by π'_i and π''_i, respectively. In this case it is particularly easy to verify the conditions from Theorem 3.6(iii): i.e., $\exp \mathcal{A}''_i$ is the correct multiset and the induced partition π''_i of $\mathcal{A}''_i$ is a factorization, cf. Remark 3.12. By $\bar{H}_i$ we indicate the image of H_i under a restriction map.

Example 3.13 shows that the order of the last two hyperplanes can't be reversed. The fact that $\mathcal{A}$ is inductively factored can also be deduced directly from Proposition 3.11. For, one checks that

$$\mathbb{K}^3 < H_1 < H_1 \cap H_2 \cap H_4 < \{0\}$$

is a maximal chain of modular elements in $L(\mathcal{A})$.

π'_i	$\exp \mathcal{A}'_i$	α_{H_i}	π''_i	$\exp \mathcal{A}''_i$
$\varnothing$	$0,0,0$	x	$\varnothing$	$0,0$
$\{H_1\}$	$0,0,1$	y	$\{\bar{H}_1\}$	$0,1$
$\{H_1\},\{H_2\}$	$0,1,1$	z	$\{\bar{H}_1\},\{\bar{H}_2\}$	$1,1$
$\{H_1\},\{H_2\},\{H_3\}$	$1,1,1$	$x+y$	$\{\bar{H}_1\},\{\bar{H}_3\}$	$1,1$
$\{H_1\},\{H_2,H_4\},\{H_3\}$	$1,1,2$	$x+y-z$	$\{\bar{H}_1\},\{\bar{H}_2,\bar{H}_4\}$	$1,2$
$\{H_1\},\{H_2,H_4\},\{H_3,H_5\}$	$1,2,2$			

TABLE 1. Induction Table of Factorizations for $\mathcal{A}$

Our next example illustrates another induction table of factorizations as explained in Remark 3.16(ii). This example shows that the converse of Proposition 3.11 is false.

Example 3.19. Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{D}_3^1$ be the 3-arrangement with defining polynomial

$$Q(\mathcal{D}_3^1) = x(x-y)(x+y)(x-z)(x+z)(y-z)(y+z).$$

Note that $\mathcal{A}$ is the restriction of a Coxeter arrangement of type D_4 to a hyperplane, cf. [OT92, Ex. 6.83]. By [JT84, Ex. 5.5], $\mathcal{A}$ is not supersolvable. In particular, $L(\mathcal{A})$ does not admit a modular element of rank 2, cf. [HR14, Lem. 2.5]. For simplicity, we enumerate the seven hyperplanes of $\mathcal{A}$ in the order their linear forms appear as factors in $Q(\mathcal{A})$, i.e. $H_1 = \ker(x), H_2 = \ker(x-y), \ldots, H_7 = \ker(y+z)$. Thanks to [JT84, Ex. 2.6], $\mathcal{A}$ is inductively free with $\exp \mathcal{A} = \{1,3,3\}$. We claim that

$$\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3) = (\{H_1\}, \{H_2, H_3, H_6\}, \{H_4, H_5, H_7\})$$

is an inductive factorization of $\mathcal{A}$. We show this using the Addition-Deletion Theorem 3.6 by exhibiting an induction table of factorizations for $\mathcal{A}$, cf. Remark 3.16(ii). By Remark 3.12 and Proposition 3.30, $\mathcal{A}_3 := \mathcal{D}_2^1 \times \Phi_1$ is an inductively factored subarrangement of $\mathcal{A}$ with defining polynomial $x(x-y)(x+y)$. We start our induction table with $\mathcal{A}_3$. We indicate the corresponding inductive factorizations of $\mathcal{A}'_i$ and $\mathcal{A}''_i$ in the columns headed by π'_i and π''_i, respectively. At each step, we have to verify the conditions in Theorem 3.6(iii): i.e., that $\exp \mathcal{A}''_i$ is the correct multiset and that the induced partition π''_i of $\mathcal{A}''_i$ is a factorization.

For brevity, we denote a partition of $\mathcal{A}$ such as $(\{H_1\}, \{H_2, H_3, H_6\}, \{H_4, H_5, H_7\})$, simply by the sets of the corresponding indices, i.e., $\{1\}, \{2,3,6\}, \{4,5,7\}$. Also, the notation $\bar{1}$ indicates the image $\varrho_i(H_1)$ in π''_i.

The exponents in Table 2 can be determined using Theorem 2.6 and [OT92, Prop. 6.82]. Note, as a 2-arrangement each $\mathcal{A}''_i$ is inductively factored, by Remark 3.12.

Noteworthy is also that this example illustrates that there is no obvious addition-deletion theorem for supersolvable arrangements, as both $\mathcal{A}'$ and $\mathcal{A}''$ are supersolvable while $\mathcal{A}$ is not.

Our next example (which was already noted by Jambu and Paris [JP95]) demonstrates that a free and factored arrangement need not be inductively factored. Moreover, it shows that the condition on $\exp \mathcal{A}''$ in Theorem 3.6(iii) is necessary for the "Deletion" statement. In

π'_i	$\exp \mathcal{A}'_i$	α_{H_i}	π''_i	$\exp \mathcal{A}''_i$
$\{1\},\{2,3\}$	$0,1,2$	$x-z$	$\{\bar{1}\},\{\bar{2},\bar{3}\}$	$1,2$
$\{1\},\{2,3\},\{4\}$	$1,1,2$	$x+z$	$\{\bar{1}\},\{\bar{2},\bar{3}\}$	$1,2$
$\{1\},\{2,3\},\{4,5\}$	$1,2,2$	$y-z$	$\{\bar{1}\},\{\bar{4},\bar{5}\}$	$1,2$
$\{1\},\{2,3,6\},\{4,5\}$	$1,2,3$	$y+z$	$\{\bar{1}\},\{\bar{2},\bar{3},\bar{6}\}$	$1,3$
$\{1\},\{2,3,6\},\{4,5,7\}$	$1,3,3$			

TABLE 2. Induction Table of Factorizations for $\mathcal{D}_3^1$

the second part of this example we illustrate that even if the underlying arrangement is inductively factored, "Addition" in Theorem 3.5 does not necessarily yield an inductive factorization, cf. Remark 3.17.

Example 3.20. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the reflection arrangement of the monomial group $G(3,3,3)$. Let x, y and z be the indeterminates of S and let $\zeta = e^{2\pi i/3}$ be a primitive 3rd root of unity. Then the defining polynomial of $\mathcal{A}$ is given by

$$Q(\mathcal{A}) = (x-y)(x-\zeta y)(x-\zeta^2 y)(x-z)(x-\zeta z)(x-\zeta^2 z)(y-z)(y-\zeta z)(y-\zeta^2 z).$$

For simplicity, we enumerate the nine hyperplanes of $\mathcal{A}$ in the order their linear forms appear as factors in $Q(\mathcal{A})$, i.e. $H_1 = \ker(x-y), \ldots, H_9 = \ker(y-\zeta^2 z)$. One checks that

$$\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3) = (\{H_1, H_2, H_4, H_5\}, \{H_7\}, \{H_3, H_6, H_8, H_9\})$$

is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}$.

Noting that $G(3,3,3)$ acts transitively on $\mathcal{A}$, [OT92, §6.4], forming a triple with respect to any choice of a hyperplane in $\mathcal{A}$ gives the following exponents

$$\exp \mathcal{A}'' = \{1,3\} \not\subseteq \exp \mathcal{A} = \{1,4,4\}. \tag{3.21}$$

One checks that for any choice of hyperplane H_0 in π_1 or π_3 above, π'' is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}''$. As a result of Remark 2.19 and (3.21), the condition on $\exp \mathcal{A}''$ in Theorem 3.6(iii) is never satisfied. Thus, although both $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}''$ are factored and free, there is no distinguished hyperplane in $\mathcal{A}$ with respect to π. In particular, $\mathcal{A}$ is not inductively factored. Indeed, as a consequence of (3.21), $\mathcal{A}'$ is not free and thus $\mathcal{A}$ is not inductively free, cf. [HR15, Ex. 2.19].

Now we apply Theorem 3.5 to obtain a nice partition of an extended arrangement. For that, set $H_{10} := \ker x$ and $\hat{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A} \cup \{H_{10}\}$. Let $\hat{\pi} = (\hat{\pi}_1, \hat{\pi}_2, \hat{\pi}_3) = (\pi_1 \cup \{H_{10}\}, \pi_2, \pi_3)$ and let $(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \hat{\mathcal{A}}' = \mathcal{A}, \hat{\mathcal{A}}'')$ be the triple associated with H_{10}. One checks that the restriction map $\varrho = \varrho_{\hat{\pi}, H_{10}} \colon \hat{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \hat{\pi}_1 \to \hat{\mathcal{A}}''$ is bijective and $\hat{\pi}'' = (\varrho(\hat{\pi}_2), \varrho(\hat{\pi}_3))$ is a factorization of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}''$. Therefore, by Theorem 3.5,

$$\hat{\pi} = (\{H_1, H_2, H_4, H_5, H_{10}\}, \{H_7\}, \{H_3, H_6, H_8, H_9\})$$

is a nice partition of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$. One can show that $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ is inductively factored, the proof is similar to the one for $\mathcal{D}_3^1$ in Example 3.19. However, $\hat{\pi}$ is not an inductive factorization of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$. For, deleting H_{10} leads to the non-inductive factorization π of $\mathcal{A}$ and the only other hyperplanes

H that can be deleted from $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \{H\}$ is free are H_7, H_8 and H_9. In each case the exponents of $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \{H\}$ are $\{1, 4, 4\}$. However, removing any of these hyperplanes from $\hat{\pi}$ results in a partition $\hat{\pi} \setminus \{H\}$ whose parts have cardinalities $\{4, 5\}$, $\{1, 3, 5\}$ and $\{1, 3, 5\}$, respectively. It thus follows from Remark 2.19 that $\hat{\pi} \setminus \{H\}$ is not nice for $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \{H\}$. In particular, $\hat{\pi}$ can't be an inductive factorization of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$.

As a further application of our Addition-Deletion Theorem 3.6, we present two examples of an arrangement $\mathcal{A}$ which is even inductively free and factored but not inductively factored. Our first example also gives an instance where there is a unique nice partition of $\mathcal{A}$. While the first example can't be realized as the intersection lattice of an arrangement over $\mathbb{C}$, the second one is based on the lattice of the reflection arrangement $\mathcal{A}(G(3, 3, 3))$ from Example 3.20.

Example 3.22. Let $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{F}_4$ be the field of 4 elements and let ζ be a primitive third root of unity in $\mathbb{K}$, so that $\zeta^2 + \zeta + 1 = 0$. Let $V = \mathbb{K}^3$ and let x, y and z be the coordinate functions of V. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the arrangment in V given by

$$Q(\mathcal{A}) = (x - y)(x - \zeta y)(x - z)(x - \zeta^2 y)(y - \zeta z)y(y - z)$$
$$(x + y + \zeta^2 z)(y - \zeta^2 z)(x - \zeta z)(x - \zeta^2 z).$$

For simplicity, we enumerate the eleven hyperplanes of $\mathcal{A}$ in the order their linear forms appear as factors in $Q(\mathcal{A})$, i.e. $H_1 = \ker(x - y), \ldots, H_{11} = \ker(x - \zeta^2 z)$. One checks that $\mathcal{A}$ is inductively free with $\exp \mathcal{A} = \{1, 4, 6\}$, where an inductive chain of hyperplanes in $\mathcal{A}$ is given by $H_1, \ldots, H_{11}$ in this order, cf. Remark 3.16(i).

Moreover, one checks that

$$\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3) = (\{H_{11}\}, \{H_1, H_3, H_9, H_{10}\}, \{H_2, H_4, H_5, H_6, H_7, H_8\})$$

is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}$ and one can show that this is the only nice partition of $\mathcal{A}$. We omit the details.

However, π is not an inductive factorizaton of $\mathcal{A}$. For, a deletion $\mathcal{A} \setminus \{H\}$ is free if and only if $H \in \{H_1, H_3, H_6, H_8, H_9, H_{10}, H_{11}\}$. For each of these instances we have $|\mathcal{A}^H| = 5$ and consequently $\exp \mathcal{A}^H = \{1, 4\}$ and $\exp \mathcal{A} \setminus \{H\} = \{1, 4, 5\}$. Therefore, for $\mathcal{A} \setminus \{H\}$ to be inductively factored, the Addition-Deletion Theorem 3.6 implies that H must belong to π_3, i.e. $H = H_6$ or $H = H_8$. Using the deletion part of Theorem 3.6 twice, we can remove both H_6 and H_8 from π_3 and so we obtain a factorization of $\mathcal{A} \setminus \{H_6, H_8\}$. However, this resulting arrangement is not inductively free (it is lattice isomorphic to $\mathcal{A}(G(3, 3, 3))$ from Example 3.20) and so it is not inductively factored, by Proposition 3.14. As a result, $\mathcal{A}$ is not inductively factored either.

Finally, we observe that the intersection lattice $L(\mathcal{A})$ of the arrangment $\mathcal{A}$ above cannot be realized over $\mathbb{C}$. For a contradiction, suppose that $\mathcal{B}$ is a complex 3-arrangement with $L(\mathcal{B})$ lattice isomorphic to $L(\mathcal{A})$. Then in particular, $\mathcal{B}$ is inductively free with $\exp \mathcal{B} = \{1, 4, 6\}$. Then, since $\mathcal{B}$ is free with $\exp \mathcal{B} = \{1, 4, 6\}$, it follows from [Z89, Thm. 11] (cf. [Y14, Thm. 1.34(ii)]) that each multi-restriction of $\mathcal{B}$ is free with exponents $\{4, 6\}$. The multi-restriction of $\mathcal{B}$ with respect to a fixed H from $\mathcal{B}$ is given by $(\mathcal{B}^H, (2, 2, 2, 2, 2))$, where $(2, 2, 2, 2, 2)$ are the multiplicities of the five hyperplanes in $\mathcal{B}^H$. Thanks to [Y14, Thm. 1.23(iii)], the

exponents of $(\mathcal{B}^H, (2,2,2,2,2))$ are $\{5,5\} \neq \{4,6\}$, a contradiction. Consequently, there is no 3-arrangement $\mathcal{B}$ over $\mathbb{C}$ whose lattice is isomorphic to $L(\mathcal{A})$.

Example 3.23. Let $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ and let ζ be a primitive third root of unity. Let $V = \mathbb{C}^3$ and let x, y and z be the coordinate functions of V. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the arrangement in V given by

$$Q(\mathcal{A}) = x(x-y)(x-\zeta y)(x-\zeta^2 y)(x-z)(x-\zeta z)(x-\zeta^2 z)$$
$$(y-z)(y-\zeta z)(y-\zeta^2 z)(x+y+\zeta^2 z).$$

For simplicity, we enumerate the eleven hyperplanes of $\mathcal{A}$ in the order their linear forms appear as factors in $Q(\mathcal{A})$, i.e. $H_1 = \ker(x), \ldots, H_{11} = \ker(x+y+\zeta^2 z)$. One checks that $\mathcal{A}$ is inductively free with $\exp \mathcal{A} = \{1,5,5\}$, where an inductive chain of hyperplanes in $\mathcal{A}$ is given by $H_1, \ldots, H_{11}$ in this order, cf. Remark 3.16(i).

The intersection lattice $L(\mathcal{A})$ is determined by the localizations of rank 2:

$\{H_1, H_2, H_3, H_4\}, \{H_1, H_5, H_6, H_7\}, \{H_1, H_8\}, \{H_1, H_9\}, \{H_1, H_{10}\}, \{H_1, H_{11}\}, \{H_2, H_5, H_8\}$, $\{H_2, H_6, H_9\}, \{H_2, H_7, H_{10}\}, \{H_2, H_{11}\}, \{H_3, H_5, H_{10}\}, \{H_3, H_6, H_8, H_{11}\}, \{H_3, H_7, H_9\}$, $\{H_4, H_5, H_9, H_{11}\}, \{H_4, H_6, H_{10}\}, \{H_4, H_7, H_8\}, \{H_7, H_{11}\}, \{H_8, H_9, H_{10}\}, \{H_{10}, H_{11}\}$.

With these at hand it is quite easy to check whether a permutation of the hyperplanes is a lattice automorphism or when a given partition of $\mathcal{A}$ is actually a factorization.

We claim that $\mathcal{A}$ has exactly two factorizations. To show this assume that $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3)$ is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}$. The singleton condition in Definition 2.14(ii) applied to the localizations $\{H_1, H_{10}\}$, $\{H_1, H_{11}\}$ and $\{H_{10}, H_{11}\}$ shows that H_1, H_{10} and H_{11} are in different parts of π. In particular, one of these three hyperplanes has to be the singleton of π.

Using Corollary 2.17(iii) on the localizations $\{H_1, H_2, H_3, H_4\}$, $\{H_2, H_{11}\}$, $\{H_1, H_5, H_6, H_7\}$ and $\{H_7, H_{11}\}$, we see that $\{H_1\}$ can't be the singleton. Else all of $H_2, H_3, H_4, H_5, H_6, H_7$, H_{11} would have to be in one part of π, but the cardinalities of the parts π_i are either 1 or 5. There is a lattice automorphism σ of $L(\mathcal{A})$ induced by (1 11)(2 9 7 8)(3 4 5 6) permuting the hyperplanes. Thus $\{H_{11}\}$ cannot be the singleton either.

Hence the only possibility is that $\pi_1 = \{H_{10}\}$ is the singleton part of π. Without loss we may assume that $H_1 \in \pi_2$ and $H_{11} \in \pi_3$. Applying the singleton condition from Definition 2.14(ii) to the localizations $\{H_1, H_8\}$, $\{H_1, H_9\}$, $\{H_2, H_{11}\}$ and $\{H_7, H_{11}\}$, it follows that $H_8, H_9 \in \pi_3$ and $H_2, H_7 \in \pi_2$. Corollary 2.17(iii) applied to the localizations $\{H_{10}, H_4, H_6\}$ and $\{H_{10}, H_3, H_5\}$ shows that $\{H_4, H_6\}$ and $\{H_3, H_5\}$ have to be subsets of one part of π.

Therefore, the only possibilities for factorizations are

$$\pi = (\{H_{10}\}, \{H_1, H_2, H_3, H_5, H_7\}, \{H_4, H_6, H_8, H_9, H_{11}\})$$

and

$$\tilde{\pi} = (\{H_{10}\}, \{H_1, H_2, H_4, H_6, H_7\}, \{H_3, H_5, H_8, H_9, H_{11}\}).$$

One checks that both π and $\tilde{\pi}$ are indeed factorizations of $\mathcal{A}$.

The permutation (2 7)(3 6)(4 5) induces an automorphism of $L(\mathcal{A})$ by permuting the corresponding hyperplanes. This automorphism interchanges π and $\tilde{\pi}$. Therefore, to show that none of π and $\tilde{\pi}$ is inductive, it suffices to consider the factorization π.

So we aim to show that π is not inductive. A deletion $\mathcal{A} \setminus \{H\}$ is free if and only if $H \in \{H_1, H_{10}, H_{11}\}$. We must not remove H_{10}, since this would contradict the singleton condition. However, using the Addition-Deletion Theorem 3.6, we can remove $H \in \{H_1, H_{11}\}$ and so we get a factorization π' of $\mathcal{A} \setminus \{H\}$ since the corresponding restriction maps ϱ are bijective. Since the automorphism σ preserves the factorization π (and interchanges H_1 and H_{11}), we only have to consider the case when $H = H_{11}$. Now let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A} \setminus \{H_{11}\}$ and let $\pi' = (\{H_{10}\}, \{H_1, H_2, H_3, H_5, H_7\}, \{H_4, H_6, H_8, H_9\})$ be the corresponding factorization. A deletion $\mathcal{B} \setminus \{H\}$ is free if and only if $H \in \{H_1, H_8, H_9, H_{10}\}$. We mustn't remove H_{10}, since this would contradict the singleton condition in Definition 2.14(ii) again. Likewise H_8 and H_9 can't be removed, since the Addition-Deletion Theorem 3.6 would then imply that the corresponding restriction map ϱ is bijective. But this is not the case, for, if we remove H_8 we have $\varrho(H_2) = \varrho(H_5)$, else if we remove H_9 we have $\varrho(H_3) = \varrho(H_7)$. But if we remove $H = H_1$ we get a factorization of $\mathcal{A}(G(3,3,3))$ which is not inductively free and therefore not inductively factored.

3.4. **Hereditarily factored Arrangements.** In analogy to hereditary freeness and hereditary inductive freeness, [OT92, Def. 4.140, p. 253], we extend the notions of factored and inductively factored arrangements to incorporate restrictions.

Definition 3.24. We say that $\mathcal{A}$ is *hereditarily factored* provided $\mathcal{A}^X$ is factored for every $X \in L(\mathcal{A})$ and that $\mathcal{A}$ is *hereditarily inductively factored* provided $\mathcal{A}^X$ is inductively factored for every $X \in L(\mathcal{A})$. We also use the acronyms $\mathcal{HFAC}$ and $\mathcal{HIFAC}$ for short for these classes, respectively.

Proposition 3.11 readily strengthens as follows.

Corollary 3.25. *If $\mathcal{A}$ is supersolvable, then it is hereditarily inductively factored.*

Proof. If $\mathcal{A}$ is supersolvable, then so is $\mathcal{A}^X$ for every $X \in L(\mathcal{A})$, thanks to [Sta72, Prop. 3.2]. Thus $\mathcal{A}^X$ is inductively factored, by Proposition 3.11 □

Also, Proposition 3.14 extends to restrictions. For, if $X \in L(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathcal{A}^X$ is inductively factored, then $\mathcal{A}^X$ is inductively free, by Proposition 3.14.

Corollary 3.26. *If $\mathcal{A}$ is hereditarily inductively factored, then it is hereditarily inductively free.*

While a 2-arrangement is always inductively factored, by Remark 2.11, in general, a factored 3-arrangement need not be inductively factored, see Example 3.20. Nevertheless, for a 3-arrangement, we have the following counterpart to [HR15, Lem. 2.15] in our setting.

Lemma 3.27. *Suppose that $\ell = 3$. Then $\mathcal{A}$ is (inductively) factored if and only if it is hereditarily (inductively) factored.*

Proof. The reverse implication is clear. For the converse, if $\mathcal{A}$ is (inductively) factored and $X \in L(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \{V\}$, then $\dim X \leq 2$. The result then follows from Remark 3.12. □

Our next example shows that the equivalence from Lemma 3.27 already fails in dimension 4.

Example 3.28. Let $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{Q}$ be the field of rational numbers. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the 4-arrangement defined by the ten forms α_{H_i} shown in column three of Table 3, where we denote the coordinate functions in S simply by x, y, z and t.

In Table 3 we present an induction table of factorizations for $\mathcal{A}$ which shows that $\mathcal{A}$ is inductively factored. In [HR15, Ex. 2.16], we showed that $\mathcal{A}$ is inductively free with $\exp \mathcal{A} = \{1, 3, 3, 3\}$, but that $\mathcal{A}$ is not hereditarily inductively free. Therefore, it follows from Corollary 3.26 that $\mathcal{A}$ is not hereditarily inductively factored. Note that the induction table in [HR15, Ex. 2.16] used a different ordering of the hyperplanes.

We enumerate the ten hyperplanes in the order they appear in Table 3, i.e. $H_1 = \ker(t), \ldots, H_{10} = \ker(z)$. We claim that

$$\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_4) = (\{H_1\}, \{H_2, H_3, H_{10}\}, \{H_4, H_5, H_9\}, \{H_6, H_7, H_8\})$$

is an inductive factorization of $\mathcal{A}$. This follows from the data in Table 3, the Addition-Deletion Theorem 3.6, along with the fact that each occurring restriction $\mathcal{A}_i''$ is itself again inductively factored with the given set of exponents which can be checked separately. As in Table 2, we indicate the corresponding inductive factorizations of $\mathcal{A}_i'$ and $\mathcal{A}_i''$ in the columns headed by π_i' and π_i'', respectively. One needs to check that $\exp \mathcal{A}_i''$ is the required multiset and that the induced partition π_i'' of $\mathcal{A}_i''$ is a factorization. As in Table 2 above, we represent the inductive factorizations π_i' of the subarrangements $\mathcal{A}_i'$ simply by listing the indices of the respective hyperplanes, and the notation $\bar{1}$ indicates the image of H_1 in π_i''.

π_i'	$\exp \mathcal{A}_i'$	α_{H_i}	π_i''	$\exp \mathcal{A}_i''$
$\varnothing$	$0, 0, 0, 0$	t	$\varnothing$	$0, 0, 0$
$\{1\}$	$0, 0, 0, 1$	$x + y - z + t$	$\{\bar{1}\}$	$0, 0, 1$
$\{1\}, \{2\}$	$0, 0, 1, 1$	$x + y - z - t$	$\{\bar{1}\}$	$0, 0, 1$
$\{1\}, \{2, 3\}$	$0, 0, 1, 2$	$x - y + z - t$	$\{\bar{1}\}, \{\bar{2}, \bar{3}\}$	$0, 1, 2$
$\{1\}, \{2, 3\}, \{4\}$	$0, 1, 1, 2$	$x - y + z + t$	$\{\bar{1}\}, \{\bar{2}, \bar{3}\}$	$0, 1, 2$
$\{1\}, \{2, 3\}, \{4, 5\}$	$0, 1, 2, 2$	$x + y + z + t$	$\{\bar{1}\}, \{\bar{2}, \bar{3}\}, \{\bar{4}, \bar{5}\}$	$1, 2, 2$
$\{1\}, \{2, 3\}, \{4, 5\}, \{6\}$	$1, 1, 2, 2$	$x + y + z - t$	$\{\bar{1}\}, \{\bar{2}, \bar{3}\}, \{\bar{4}, \bar{5}\}$	$1, 2, 2$
$\{1\}, \{2, 3\}, \{4, 5\}, \{6, 7\}$	$1, 2, 2, 2$	y	$\{\bar{1}\}, \{\bar{2}, \bar{3}\}, \{\bar{4}, \bar{5}\}$	$1, 2, 2$
$\{1\}, \{2, 3\}, \{4, 5\}, \{6, 7, 8\}$	$1, 2, 2, 3$	x	$\{\bar{1}\}, \{\bar{2}, \bar{3}\}, \{\bar{6}, \bar{7}, \bar{8}\}$	$1, 2, 3$
$\{1\}, \{2, 3\}, \{4, 5, 9\}, \{6, 7, 8\}$	$1, 2, 3, 3$	z	$\{\bar{1}\}, \{\bar{4}, \bar{5}, \bar{9}\}, \{\bar{6}, \bar{7}, \bar{8}\}$	$1, 3, 3$
$\{1\}, \{2, 3, 10\}, \{4, 5, 9\}, \{6, 7, 8\}$	$1, 3, 3, 3$			

TABLE 3. Induction Table of Factorizations for $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{IFAC} \setminus \mathcal{HIFAC}$.

3.5. **Products of factored Arrangements.** In this section we show that the various notions of factorizations from the previous sections are compatible with the product construction for arrangements.

Proposition 3.29. *Let $(\mathcal{A}_1, V_1), (\mathcal{A}_2, V_2)$ be two arrangements. Then $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2, V_1 \oplus V_2)$ is nice if and only if both $(\mathcal{A}_1, V_1)$ and $(\mathcal{A}_2, V_2)$ are nice.*

Proof. First assume that both $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are nice. Let $\pi^i = (\pi^i_1, \ldots, \pi^i_{r_i})$ be a nice partition of $\mathcal{A}_i$, where r_i is the rank of $\mathcal{A}_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then $r = r_1 + r_2$ is the rank of $\mathcal{A}$. Define a partition $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_{r_1}, \pi_{r_1+1}, \ldots, \pi_r)$ of $\mathcal{A}$ by setting $\pi_j = \{H_1 \oplus V_2 \mid H_1 \in \pi^1_j\}$ for $1 \leq j \leq r_1$ and $\pi_{j+r_1} = \{V_1 \oplus H_2 \mid H_2 \in \pi^2_j\}$ for $1 \leq j \leq r_2$. We claim that π is nice for $\mathcal{A}$.

Since π^1, π^2 are independent, so is π, by construction. Let $X = X_1 \oplus X_2 \in L(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \{V_1 \oplus V_2\}$, cf. (2.2). Without loss, assume that $X_1 \neq V_1$ (else $X_2 \neq V_2$.) Then, since π^1 is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}_1$, there is a block π^1_k such that $\pi^1_k \cap \mathcal{A}_{X_1} = \{H_1\}$ is a singleton, and thus, by definition of π and using (2.1) and (2.3), we see that

$$\pi_k \cap \mathcal{A}_X = (\pi^1_k \cap \mathcal{A}_{X_1}) \oplus V_2 = \{H_1 \oplus V_2\}$$

is a singleton, as required.

Conversely, suppose that π is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}$. We define partitions π^i of $\mathcal{A}_i$ for $i = 1, 2$ simply by taking as blocks the hyperplanes in $\mathcal{A}_i$ that occur as a direct summand of a member in a block of π. More precisely, the non-empty $\pi^1_j = \{H_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1 \mid H_1 \oplus V_2 \in \pi_j\}$ are the blocks of π^1; π^2 is defined analogously.

We claim that π^i is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. We show this for π^1, the proof for π^2 is completely analogous.

Since π is independent, so is π^1. Let $X_1 \in L(\mathcal{A}_1) \setminus \{V_1\}$. Then $X = X_1 \oplus V_2$ belongs to $L(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \{V_1 \oplus V_2\}$, cf. (2.2). Since π is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}$, there is a block, π_k say, such that $\pi_k \cap \mathcal{A}_X = \{H_1 \oplus V_2\}$ is a singleton. But then, using (2.1) and (2.3) again, $\pi^1_k \cap \mathcal{A}_{X_1} = \{H_1\}$, as required. Consequently, π^1 is nice for $\mathcal{A}_1$, as claimed. □

We can strengthen Proposition 3.29 further and restrict the compatibility with products to the class of inductively factored arrangements.

Proposition 3.30. *Let $(\mathcal{A}_1, V_1), (\mathcal{A}_2, V_2)$ be two arrangements. Then $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2, V_1 \oplus V_2)$ is inductively factored if and only if both $(\mathcal{A}_1, V_1)$ and $(\mathcal{A}_2, V_2)$ are inductively factored and in that case the multiset of exponents of $\mathcal{A}$ is given by $\exp \mathcal{A} = \{\exp \mathcal{A}_1, \exp \mathcal{A}_2\}$.*

Proof. First suppose that both $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are inductively factored. As both are factored, so is $\mathcal{A}$, by Proposition 3.29. We show that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$ is inductively factored by induction on $n = |\mathcal{A}| = |\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{A}_2|$. For $n = 0$ we have $\mathcal{A} = \Phi_\ell$ and there is nothing to prove. Now suppose that $n \geq 1$ and that the result holds for products of inductively factored arrangements with less than n hyperplanes. Let $\pi^i = (\pi^i_1, \ldots, \pi^i_{r_i})$ be an inductive factorization of $\mathcal{A}_i$, where r_i is the rank of $\mathcal{A}_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then $r = r_1 + r_2$ is the rank of $\mathcal{A}$. As in the proof of Proposition 3.29, define a partition $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_{r_1}, \pi_{r_1+1}, \ldots, \pi_r)$ of $\mathcal{A}$ by setting $\pi_j = \{H_1 \oplus V_2 \mid H_1 \in \pi^1_j\}$ for $1 \leq j \leq r_1$ and $\pi_{j+r_1} = \{V_1 \oplus H_2 \mid H_2 \in \pi^2_j\}$ for $1 \leq j \leq r_2$. By the argument in the proof of Proposition 3.29, π is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}$.

Without loss, we may assume that $|\mathcal{A}_1| > 0$ and that there is a hyperplane $H_1 \in \pi^1_1$ which is distinguished with respect to π^1 so that $\mathcal{A}'_1 = \mathcal{A}_1 \setminus \{H_1\}$ and $\mathcal{A}''_1 = \mathcal{A}_1^{H_1}$ are inductively

factored. Let $H_0 = H_1 \oplus V_2 \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ be the triple with respect to H_0. Let $\pi' = \pi \cap \mathcal{A}'$ be the induced partition. Then for the parts of π' we have

$$\pi'_1 = \pi_1 \setminus \{H_0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \pi'_i = \pi_i \quad \text{for } 2 \leq i \leq r. \tag{3.31}$$

We claim that H_0 is distinguished with respect to π. So we need to show that π' is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}'$. Since π is independent, clearly so is π'.

Let $X \in L(\mathcal{A}') \setminus \{V_1 \oplus V_2\}$. Then $X = X_1 \oplus X_2$, where $X_1 \in L(\mathcal{A}'_1)$ and $X_2 \in L(\mathcal{A}_2)$, cf. (2.1) and (2.2). If $X_2 \neq V_2$, then by assumption on π^2, there exists a π^2_j for some $1 \leq j \leq r_2$ so that $\pi^2_j \cap (\mathcal{A}_2)_{X_2}$ is a singleton. Thus, by (2.3) and (3.31),

$$\pi'_{j+r_1} \cap (\mathcal{A}')_X = \pi_{j+r_1} \cap (\mathcal{A}')_X = V_1 \oplus \left(\pi^2_j \cap (\mathcal{A}_2)_{X_2}\right)$$

is a singleton. Now suppose that $X_2 = V_2$. Then $X_1 \neq V_1$. Consequently, since H_1 is distinguished for π^1, there is a π^1_k for some $1 \leq k \leq r_1$ so that $\pi^1_k \cap (\mathcal{A}'_1)_{X_1} = \{H'\}$ is a singleton. Since $H_1 \notin \mathcal{A}'_1$, we have $H' \neq H_1$. Consequently, we have

$$\pi'_k \cap (\mathcal{A}')_X = \pi_k \cap (\mathcal{A}')_X = \left(\pi^1_k \cap (\mathcal{A}'_1)_{X_1}\right) \oplus V_2 = \{H' \oplus V_2\}$$

is a singleton.

Thanks to (2.1) and (2.4) and our results above, $\mathcal{A}' = \mathcal{A}'_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$ and $\mathcal{A}'' = \mathcal{A}''_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$ are both products of inductively factored arrangements. Therefore, since $|\mathcal{A}'|, |\mathcal{A}''| < n$, it follows from our induction hypothesis that both $\mathcal{A}'$ and $\mathcal{A}''$ are inductively factored. As H_0 is distinguished with respect to π, it follows from Proposition 3.4 that $\varrho : \mathcal{A} \setminus \pi_1 \to \mathcal{A}''$ is bijective and thus $\mathcal{A}$ is inductively factored, as desired.

Conversely, suppose that π is an inductive factorization of $\mathcal{A}$. Then by Proposition 3.29, both $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are factored. As in the proof of Proposition 3.29, we define partitions π^i of $\mathcal{A}_i$ for $i = 1, 2$ simply by taking as blocks the hyperplanes in $\mathcal{A}_i$ that occur as a direct summand of a member in a block of π. More precisely, the non-empty $\pi^1_j = \{H_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1 \mid H_1 \oplus V_2 \in \pi_j\}$ are the blocks of π^1; π^2 is defined analogously.

We show that both $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are inductively factored again by induction on $n = |\mathcal{A}|$. If $n = 0$, then $\mathcal{A} = \Phi_\ell$ and so both $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are empty and there is nothing to show. So suppose that $n \geq 1$ and that the result holds for products which are inductively factored and have less than n hyperplanes. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is inductively factored, there is a distinguished hyperplane H_0 in $\mathcal{A}$, so that the triple $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ with respect to H_0 is a triple of inductively factored arrangements. Without loss, we may assume that $H_0 = H_1 \oplus V_2$ is distinguished with respect to π, for some $H_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1$.

We claim that H_1 is distinguished with respect to π^1. Let $(\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}'_1, \mathcal{A}''_1)$ be the triple associated with H_1. We need to show that $\pi^1 \cap \mathcal{A}'_1$ is a factorization of $\mathcal{A}'_1$. Since π^1 is independent, so is $\pi^1 \cap \mathcal{A}'_1$. Let $X_1 \in L(\mathcal{A}'_1) \setminus \{V_1\}$. Then $X = X_1 \oplus V_2$ belongs to $L(\mathcal{A}') \setminus \{V_1 \oplus V_2\}$, cf. (2.2). Since π is an inductive factorization of $\mathcal{A}$, there is a part π_k of π so that $\pi_k \cap (\mathcal{A}')_X$ is a singleton. Thus, using (2.3), we see that

$$\pi_k \cap (\mathcal{A}')_X = \left(\pi^1_k \cap (\mathcal{A}'_1)_{X_1}\right) \oplus V_2$$

and so $\pi^1_k \cap (\mathcal{A}'_1)_{X_1}$ is a singleton, as desired.

Thanks to (2.1) and (2.4), both $\mathcal{A}' = \mathcal{A}'_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$ and $\mathcal{A}'' = \mathcal{A}''_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$ are products. Therefore, since $|\mathcal{A}'|, |\mathcal{A}''| < n$ and both $\mathcal{A}'$ and $\mathcal{A}''$ are inductively factored, it follows from our induction hypothesis that also $\mathcal{A}'_1$, $\mathcal{A}''_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are inductively factored. Since H_1 is distinguished with respect to π^1, it follows from Proposition 3.4 that the restriction map ϱ_{π^1,H_1} is bijective and thus $\mathcal{A}_1$ is inductively factored as well.

The final statement on exponents follows from Proposition 2.5 and the fact that inductively factored arrangements are free, Proposition 3.14. □

The compatibility from Propositions 3.29 and 3.30 restricts even further to the classes of hereditarily factored and hereditarily inductively factored arrangements, respectively.

Corollary 3.32. *Let $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ be two arrangements. Then $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$ is hereditarily (inductively) factored if and only if both $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are hereditarily (inductively) factored. In case of inductively factored arrangements the multiset of exponents of $\mathcal{A}$ is given by* $\exp \mathcal{A} = \{\exp \mathcal{A}_1, \exp \mathcal{A}_2\}$.

Proof. First suppose that both $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are hereditarily (inductively) factored. Let $X = X_1 \oplus X_2$ be in $L(\mathcal{A})$. Then, by (2.4) and Proposition 3.29 (Proposition 3.30), $\mathcal{A}^X = \mathcal{A}_1^{X_1} \times \mathcal{A}_2^{X_2}$ is (inductively) factored.

Conversely, suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is hereditarily (inductively) factored. Let $X_i \in L(\mathcal{A}_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then $X = X_1 \oplus X_2 \in L(\mathcal{A})$. By (2.4) and Proposition 3.29 (Proposition 3.30), both $\mathcal{A}_1^{X_1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_2^{X_2}$ are (inductively) factored.

The final statement on exponents follows from Propositions 2.5 and the fact that inductively factored arrangements are free, Proposition 3.14. □

Utilizing the results of this note, in our final comment we compare various classes of free and factored arrangements.

Remark 3.33. For the first purpose of this remark let $\mathcal{SS}$, $\mathcal{IFAC}$, $\mathcal{IF}$, $\mathcal{RF}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ denote the classes of supersolvable, inductively factored, inductively free, recursively free ([OT92, Def. 4.60]), and free arrangements, respectively. Thanks to Proposition 3.14 ([JP95, Prop. 2.2]), Proposition 3.11 and the definition of $\mathcal{RF}$, we have the following containments

$$\mathcal{SS} \subseteq \mathcal{IFAC} \subseteq \mathcal{IF} \subseteq \mathcal{RF} \subseteq \mathcal{F}.$$

It follows from Example 3.19 that the first inclusion is proper. Thanks to Remark 3.15(ii), the Coxeter arrangement of type D_4 is not inductively factored but inductively free. Thus the second inclusion is also proper.

By [HR15, Thm. 1.1], $\mathcal{A}(G(3,3,3))$ is not inductively free. But thanks to [AHR14, Thm. 3.6(ii)], $\mathcal{A}(G(3,3,3))$ is recursively free. Thus the third inclusion is proper.

Terao [Ter80] has shown that each reflection arrangement $\mathcal{A}(W)$ is free (cf. [OT92, §6]). In [CH15, Rem. 3.7], Cuntz and the first author showed that the reflection arrangement $\mathcal{A}(G_{27})$ of the rank 3 exceptional complex reflection group G_{27} is not recursively free. Consequently, the final inclusion is also proper.

Thus we have proper inclusions throughout:

$$\mathcal{SS} \subsetneq \mathcal{IFAC} \subsetneq \mathcal{IF} \subsetneq \mathcal{RF} \subsetneq \mathcal{F}.$$

It is also of interest to compare the hereditary classes from above. For that purpose let $\mathcal{FAC}$ be the class of nice arrangements from Definition 2.14, while $\mathcal{HFAC}$ and $\mathcal{HIFAC}$ denote the classes of hereditarily factored and hereditarily inductively factored arrangements from Definition 3.24. Then by definition and Corollary 3.25, we have

$$\mathcal{SS} \subseteq \mathcal{HIFAC} \subseteq \mathcal{HFAC} \subseteq \mathcal{FAC}.$$

It follows from Example 3.19 and Lemma 3.27 that the first inclusion is proper.

Thanks to Example 3.20, $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(G(3,3,3))$ is factored and thus by Lemma 3.27, $\mathcal{A}$ belongs to $\mathcal{HFAC}$. However, since $\mathcal{A}$ is not inductively free, it does not belong to $\mathcal{HIFAC}$. Consequently, the second inclusion is proper.

The fact that the final inclusion is proper follows from Example 3.28. For, here one can check that the restriction of $\mathcal{A}$ to $H_1 = \ker(t)$ gives a 3-arrangement whose Poincaré polynomial does not factor into linear terms over $\mathbb{Z}$. It follows from Corollary 2.17(i) that $\mathcal{A}^{H_1}$ is not nice and therefore, $\mathcal{A}$ is not hereditarily factored. Therefore, we also have proper inclusions throughout here as well:

$$\mathcal{SS} \subsetneq \mathcal{HIFAC} \subsetneq \mathcal{HFAC} \subsetneq \mathcal{FAC}.$$

That all these classes of arrangements differ is not surprising. Quite striking however is the fact that counterexamples to essentially each reverse containment are found among the small rank reflection arrangements and their restrictions.

References

[AHR14] N. Amend, T. Hoge and G. Röhrle, *On inductively free restrictions of reflection arrangements*, J. Algebra, **418** (2014), 197–212.

[BZ91] A. Björner and G. Ziegler, *Broken circuit complexes: Factorisations and Generalizations*, J. of Comb. Theory , Series B **51**, (1991) 96–126.

[CH15] M. Cuntz and T. Hoge, *Free but not Recursively Free Arrangements*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **143**, (2015), 35–40.

[HR14] T. Hoge and G. Röhrle, *On supersolvable reflection arrangements*, Proc. AMS, **142** (2014), no. 11, 3787–3799.

[HR15] ———, *On inductively free reflection arrangements*, J. Reine u. Angew. Math. **701** (2015), 205–220.

[J90] M. Jambu, *Fiber-type arrangements and factorization properties*. Adv. Math. **80** (1990), no. 1, 1–21.

[JP95] M. Jambu and L. Paris, *Combinatorics of Inductively Factored Arrangements*, Europ. J. Combinatorics **16** (1995), 267–292.

[JT84] M. Jambu and H. Terao, *Free arrangements of hyperplanes and supersolvable lattices*, Adv. in Math. **52** (1984), no. 3, 248–258.

[OS80] P. Orlik and L. Solomon, *Combinatorics and topology of complements of hyperplanes*, Invent. math. **56** (1980), 77–94.

[OST84] P. Orlik, L. Solomon, and H. Terao, *Arrangements of hyperplanes and differential forms*. Combinatorics and algebra (Boulder, Colo., 1983), 29–65, Contemp. Math., **34**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1984.

[OT92] P. Orlik and H. Terao, *Arrangements of hyperplanes*, Springer-Verlag, 1992.

[Sta72] R. P. Stanley, *Supersolvable lattices*, Algebra Universalis **2** (1972), 197–217.
[Ter80] H. Terao, *Arrangements of hyperplanes and their freeness I, II*, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo **27** (1980), 293–320.
[Ter81] ———, *Generalized exponents of a free arrangement of hyperplanes and Shepherd-Todd-Brieskorn formula*, Invent. Math. **63** no. 1 (1981) 159–179.
[Ter92] ———, *Factorizations of the Orlik-Solomon Algebras*, Adv. in Math. **92**, (1992), 45–53.
[Y14] M. Yoshinaga, *Freeness of hyperplane arrangements and related topics*, Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. Sér. 6 (2014), 483–512.
[Z89] G. Ziegler, *Multiarrangements of hyperplanes and their freeness*. Singularities (Iowa City, IA, 1986), 345–359, Contemp. Math., **90**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1989.
[Z90] ———, *Matroid representations and free arrangements*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **320** (1990), no. 2, 525–541.

Institut für Algebra, Zahlentheorie und Diskrete Mathematik, Fakultät für Mathematik und Physik, Leibniz Universität Hannover, Welfengarten 1, 30167 Hannover, Germany

E-mail address: hoge@math.uni-hannover.de

Fakultät für Mathematik, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, D-44780 Bochum, Germany

E-mail address: gerhard.roehrle@rub.de